The LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

VOLUME XVII OCTOBER, 1944 NUMBER 4

THE PREACHING OF REPENTANCE
By Russell D. Snyder

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN REVIEW
By C. B. Gohdes

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY: A SYMPOSIUM

The Obligation of the Church to the Social Order . *By Oscar Fisher Blackwelder*
The Responsibility of the Church in the World . . *By Conrad Bergendoff*
By Conrad Bergendoff
Major Responsibilities of the Church in Social Action . *By Walton H. Greever*
Christianity and the World of Nations . . . . *By O. Frederick Nolde*

HENRY EYSTER JACOBS (1844-1932) IN RETROSPECT
By Benjamin Lotz

COURAGE TO FACE THE FUTURE
By Raymond T. Stamm

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS IN LUTHERAN THEOLOGY
By Otto W. Heick

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

INDEX TO VOLUME XVII

TIMES AND NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER

Contributors to This Issue 326

ARTICLES

The Preaching of Repentance. *By Russell D. Snyder* 327

A Review of the Traditional Lutheran Position on the Lord's Supper. *By C. B. Gohdes* 340

The Church and Society: A Symposium

The Obligation of the Church to the Social Order. *By Oscar Fisher Blackwelder* 361

The Responsibility of the Church in the World's Social Improvement. *By Conrad Bergendoff* 366

Major Responsibilities of the Church in Social Action. *By Walton H. Greever* 369

Christianity and the World of Nations. *By O. Frederick Nolde* 373

Henry Eyster Jacobs (1844-1932) in Retrospect. *By Benjamin Lotz* 382

Courage to Face the Future. *By Raymond T. Stamm* 394

The Doctrine of the Last Things in Lutheran Theology. *By Otto W. Heick* 421

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

Jones, *The Christ of the American Road* (D. F. Putman) 437

Ferré, *Return to Christianity* (John W. Rilling) 438

Rudisill, *Christian Family Life* (Paul J. Kirsch) 438

Lindblom, *You That Labor* (W. Roy Hashinger) 439

Albright, *A History of the Evangelical Church* (Robert Fortenbaugh) 440

The Chapel Hymnal (Theodore K. Finck) 440

Gibbings, *Sweet Thames Run Softly, Coming Down the Wye* (Arnold F. Keller) 441

Hoh, *Parish Practice* (L. Ralph Tabor) 441

Roberts & van Dusen, *Liberal Theology* (H. Offermann) 443

Boettner, *The Person of Christ* (H. D. Hoover) 444

Palmer, *Aids to Worship* (H. D. Hoover) 445

Menges, *The Altar Guild* (H. D. Hoover) 445

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

Editors

Theodore G. Tappert
Paul J. Hoh
Philadelphia

Harvey D. Hoover
Raymond T. Stamm
Gettysburg

Volume XVII | October, 1944 | Number 4

Published quarterly by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly* (founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849) and *The Lutheran Church Review* (founded in Philadelphia in 1882). Entered at the Gettysburg Post Office as second-class matter.

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals.*

Subscription $2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents. Subscriptions and all business communications should be addressed to Professor Harvey D. Hoover, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Manuscripts, books for review, and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to Professor Theodore G. Tappert, 7333 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The aims of THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY are (1) to give intellectual expression to the faith of the United Lutheran Church in America as set forth in its doctrinal basis, to maintain that faith, and to show constantly its relation to the practical religious living of those who hold it; (2) to promote cordial understandings between the bodies of Lutherans, both in America and Europe, and between Lutheran and other Christian groups; (3) to discuss, in a constructive and helpful manner, the relation of the faith of the Lutheran Church to the religious issues involved in contemporary life and thought.

The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they shall be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they shall be free from controversial animus; and that their contents shall be of real scholarly and practical value to the reader. THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY shall be conducted with due regard for the Christian liberty which proves all things and holds fast that which is good, and for which the Lutheran Church has always stood. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, will not of itself exclude articles from publication, since the editors will not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors. The editors reserve the right to reject any article without assigning a reason for their action.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

RUSSELL D. SNYDER, professor of New Testament Literature and Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary, is a contributor to several symposia on preaching.

C. B. GOHDES, author of *Does the Modern Papacy Require a New Evaluation?* (Burlington, Iowa: 1940), is professor of History in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

OSCAR F. BLACKWELDER, pastor of the Church of the Reformation in Washington, D. C., is widely known for his participation in co-operative enterprises among the churches, especially in evangelism.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF, president of Augustana College and Seminary in Rock Island, Illinois, is an incisive thinker whose influence has spread far beyond the limits of the Augustana Synod.

WALTON H. GREEVER is secretary of the United Lutheran Church in America and author of numerous studies in the social field, including *Human Relationships and the Church, A Study of Present-Day Social Problems* (New York: 1939).

O. FREDERICK NOLDE, professor of Christian Education in the Philadelphia Seminary, is author of *Christian World Action: The Christian Builds for Tomorrow* (Philadelphia: 1942, 1943).

BENJAMIN LOTZ is pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and a contributor to many church journals.

OTTO W. HEICK is co-author, with the late J. L. Neve, of *A History of Christian Thought* (Volume I, Philadelphia: 1943), the second and concluding volume of which is scheduled to appear from the press shortly.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are DWIGHT F. PUTMAN, pastor of Christ Church in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; JOHN W. RILLING, pastor of First Church in Springfield, Ohio; PAUL J. KIRSCH, pastor of Calvary Church in the Bronx, New York City; W. ROY HASHINGER, pastor of St. Paul's Church, Morgantown, West Virginia; ROBERT FORTENBAUGH, professor of History in Gettysburg College; THEODORE K. FINCK, editor-in-chief of the new series of Sunday School literature, *The Christian Growth Course;* ARNOLD F. KELLER, pastor of the Church of the Redeemer in Utica, New York; L. RALPH TABOR, pastor of Luther Place Memorial Church in Washington, D. C.; and H. OFFERMANN, professor of the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary.

THE PREACHING OF REPENTANCE

RUSSELL D. SNYDER
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

THE purpose of this study is to define a problem, not to solve it. The problem is how to win the people in our parishes to repentance. It is a problem which man cannot solve. The New Testament teaches that it is God who gives men repentance and our Confessions consistently echo the thought. Our part in the process is to offer the kind of testimony which God would have us offer. Before we can offer this testimony, however, we must make sure that we understand what repentance implies. It is hoped that this study will be of some help to our pastors in their preaching and teaching in this area.

The General Situation

Since the outbreak of the war, the call to repentance has taken on a significant urgency in Christian circles. Some groups are preoccupied with it to the point of morbidity. We even find it placarded on billboards along the highways, or written crudely in chalk on old buildings or in subway ramps and concourses. We seldom give these legends a passing thought, yet we secretly wish that all the world would heed them. Most of us are convinced that if peace and righteousness are to flourish in the world of tomorrow, the nations must repent, the churches must repent, the individuals in the churches must repent. As Professor William Douglas Chamberlain puts it in a recent book on this subject, "It will do us little good to 'win the war,' if we go on doing the things that provoke wars. Scientific and industrial achievement will make each succeeding war more terrible than its predecessor, unless we learn to live together. The New Testament idea of repentance offers the solution."[1]

1 *The Meaning of Repentance*, p. 18.

But what is the New Testament idea of repentance? It is to be feared that most of our people, perhaps also some of our pastors, have completely misread our Lord's mind on this point. They interpret repentance almost exclusively in terms of contrition, sometimes even attrition. They take for granted that if they rue their sins, experience emotional regret over them, or indulge in sundry afflictions of the soul in order to make amends for them, they are fulfilling this primary precept of the gospel. For the most part they equate repentance with remorse for one's sins; they forget that one can be sorry for one's sins and still cling to them.

For this popular misconception several factors are responsible. One of them is the heavy weight of tradition. Luther reacted violently against the soul-destroying system of penances and indulgences which dominated religious life in the Middle Ages. Though concurring heartily in his revolt against this system, many of his followers have failed to slough off the folk theology on which the system was based. They still cling to medieval notions concerning repentance.

A second factor in the situation is the inadequacy of our definitions. Whenever we have a sequence of related terms before us, such as repentance, conversion, and regeneration, we habitually think in terms of the things in which they differ rather than in terms of the things which they have in common. Take repentance and regeneration, for example. In the New Testament these are broad, sweeping concepts that overlap and run together; but by the time they have percolated into the mind of the man in the pew, repentance has become one thing, regeneration another. The deterioration begins with an overemphasis upon the backward look in repentance. The final step is to equate repentance with remorse for one's sins, and that is simply not Christian. One wonders whether the time has not come when we ought to reexamine our traditional definitions in the light of the science of semantics. To define is to set limits, and the New Testament does not set limits; it demolishes them.

A third factor is the inadequacy of our translations of the

repentance texts in the New Testament. Unfortunately the English language lacks a precise equivalent of the Greek word for repentance. This lack puts the translators in a quandary. As a rule they resort to the word 'repent' in the dubious and chimerical hope that the public will eventually learn to read into it the meaning which the word has in the original. Even Luther, who laid a vigorous and altogether wholesome emphasis on the thought that to repent means to "assume another mind and disposition," found it necessary to resort to the conventional *Thut Busse* in his translation of the Scriptures. The only translation that approximates the meaning which the word has in the teachings of Jesus is the modern German version by Ludwig Albright, *Aendert euren Sinn.* In view of the wide range of meaning which the word *Sinn* has acquired in the German idiom, this translation is relatively accurate, but we have nothing comparable to it in our language.

At all events, we owe it to ourselves and to our people to give special thought to this matter in our preaching and teaching. One wonders whether this is being done. In a spirited message to his people in his parish bulletin, one of our pastors asked them, "How often have you seen the tear of repentance?" The tear of repentance! You see how that metaphor subtly conveys the suggestion that one's repentance is to be measured by the number or the temperature of one's tears. It would seem that some of our pastors are still striking a sub-Christian note in their calls to repentance. Instead of abating popular misconceptions, they actually foster them.

The Meaning of the Word

We are now ready to consider the sense in which the word is employed in the New Testament. The standard word for repentance is *metanoia,* which means 'change of mind.' Unfortunately, in many of the translations the word 'repent' is also applied to the verb *metamelesthai,* which occurs only five times. For example, in Mt. 27:3 we read, "Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and

brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders." Can we blame the ordinary layman for being bewildered by this phraseology? Here was a man who repented and then went out and hanged himself! It must be admitted that there are lexicographers who take the two words as practical equivalents; but most of the specialists contend that there is enough difference between them to warrant a difference in the translation. Weymouth translates the Judas passage, "Then when Judas, who had betrayed Him, saw that He was condemned, smitten with remorse he brought back the thirty shekels to the High Priests and Elders."

At all events, it should never be forgotten that the standard word for repentance in the New Testament is *metanoia*. The noun occurs 24 times, the verb 31 times, mostly in the Synoptics, the Book of Acts, and the Apocalypse. Although it means literally 'change of mind,' the change of mind which it contemplates goes deep. It takes in a good deal more than the intellectual faculty, more even than purpose or intention. Some of us have learned that when they are on the trail of a new bonnet, our wives can change their minds, literally, at the drop of a hat! The change of mind which the New Testament calls repentance implies a basic change, in the fundamental sense in which the word *nous* is used in the Greek. It implies that the individual is ready to turn his back, once and for all time, upon the old life, the old world, and gratefully submit to the new order prepared for him in the Kingdom. As such it implies, not only a turning away from sin, but also a turning to God, actual surrender to Him with all that such surrender entails.

It should also be clearly understood that there are innumerable passages where the thought of repentance is in the background even though the word is not used. Jesus was even calling men to repentance when He was working miracles. In Mt. 11:20 f. we read, "Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not. Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty words, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre

and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." Richly understood, the miracles are not merely humanitarian acts; they are also urgent and compelling calls to repentance.

Four Aspects of Repentance

We are now ready to ask, How can we make the teachings of the New Testament on this subject clear to our people? To try to split up any of these sweeping concepts into its component parts is precarious business from the theological point of view, but in view of the general situation we may be justified in reminding our people that repentance normally has four aspects or stages.

The first is, indeed, sorrow for sin, not the pagan sorrow that is without faith, but the godly sorrow that is born of faith. The writer of an article in the old *Lutheran Church Review* in the year 1900 made much of this thought. He pointed out that contrition had become an obsolete, discredited virtue. In that respect the situation has not changed materially since the turn of the century. Most of our people are willing to admit that they are sinners, but some of them do not seem to be the least bit concerned about the situation. The rest seem to take for granted that if they are even measurably sorry for their sins, they have fulfilled this primary precept. It would do them no harm if they could be inoculated with a little more of that cold, black horror which overtook the saints of old when they thought of their sins. They take their sins too lightly. At the same time it must be made crystal clear to them that mere sorrow for sin is not repentance. It may be simple paganism, what Paul calls the sorrow of this world which "worketh death." Saul was sorry for his sins. Judas was sorry for his sins, so sorry that he went out and hanged himself.

A second aspect of repentance is confession. To repent is to confess. The more penitent the sinner is, the more he will want to confess his sins. He will not have to be coerced or browbeaten into making his confession. Common honesty demands that our

confession be a confession before the God whom we have affronted; common honesty also demands that it be a confession before men. Anything short of that would be hypocrisy. That is one of the values of our order of worship. We begin every Service by confessing our sins to God in the presence of one another. Assuming that we mean what we say, this act of confession has the effect of putting our relations to God and to one another on an honest, realistic basis, and that is a good beginning. In this connection it may be worth recalling that, although our church rightly insists upon public confession as the normal practice, it has never officially abolished private confession. The survival of the Order for Private Confession and Absolution may be taken as a testimony to our conviction that some opportunity should be provided for those so inclined to come to the church privately with their sins. The churches court disaster when they shunt this question of sin to the side, or fail to help men find a soul-satisfying solution.

A third aspect of repentance is the forswearing of sin. To repent is to be sorry enough to quit. When those who were not sorry enough to quit came to John to be baptized, his eyes blazed hotly and a clean anger rushed over him. "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" he cried. He pictured the coming Messiah as having a winnowing fan in His hand and reminded them that the chaff will some day be winnowed from the wheat and burned with unquenchable fire.

A winnowing fan in His hand! How can we forget that picture? How can we let our people forget it? "What meaneth then this bleating of sheep in mine ears, and the lowing of oxen which I hear?" asked Samuel of Saul when the latter pretended that he had obeyed instructions and exterminated the flocks of the Amalekites. You remember the King's prayer in the *Tragedy of Hamlet*:

> But, O, what form of prayer
> Can serve my turn? 'Forgive me my foul murder?'
> That cannot be; since I am still possess'd
> Of those effects for which I did the murder. . . .
> May one be pardon'd and retain th' offence?[2]

2 Act III, Scene iii, Lines 51 ff.

"May one be pardoned and retain the offence?" We repent, yet we do not repent. We are sorry for our sins, yet we are not sorry for them, not sorry enough to quit!

If we were to stop at this point, however, we could not say that we had passed beyond the Old Testament in our pulpit interpretations of this doctrine. The New Testament throws the primary emphasis on the positive side of the process. To repent in the New Testament sense is to accept in simple faith the forgiveness offered to us in the gospel and then put on the Lord Jesus Christ and His righteousness. It is to become a new man, in Him and by His grace. It is more than a matter of being sorry for one's sins, more even than a matter of being sorry enough to quit. It is a matter of dethroning self and enthroning Christ, letting Christ take the place of self in us. As such it calls for a complete renovation of the mind, heart, and will—what Coleridge called the 'transmentation' of the individual. Professor Chamberlain describes it right aptly as "a pilgrimage from the mind of the flesh to the mind of Christ."[3]

In other words, repentance is more than an act or a sequence of acts. To equate it with the emotional reaction that ushers in the Christian life according to beliefs prevalent in some of the sects, or with the bouts of remorse that overtake us when conscience drives our careless natures into a corner, is to strip this doctrine of its primary meaning. Repentance is the condition in man that results from his regeneration. It is the work of God in us, a total attitude and a permanent state, a life-long pilgrimage that has as its goal the death of the old Adam and the birth of a new man.

A Gospel for Sinners

Our people need to have this gospel preached to them in season and out of season for two reasons. They need it, first, because they are sinners. Many of them have been misled by the vestiges of humanism in our folk attitudes and folk ways. Hu-

3 W. D. Chamberlain, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

manism as a religious philosophy has been discredited by its fruits, but the man on the street is still under the spell of its teachings. He is still putting his trust in man. Only consider the optimistic twitterings in the press and on the radio about the brave new world which man is going to build with his own hands after the war, without the help of God. Not a word is said about man's guilt. Not a word is said about his helplessness before the disintegrating forces inherent in his nature. Not a word is said about his need of forgiveness.

Yet, sin remains! Yes, sin remains, a stubborn fact, a reality that cannot be evaded. What we need in the face of this reality is a little more realism, ordinary intellectual honesty, if you please. After all, as Amiel put it long ago, the cardinal question is that of sin.[4] That it is still the cardinal question for us all becomes clear the moment we make an honest effort to do the Father's will. We immediately find that we are not like Jesus in our relation to the Father's will. It is not natural for us to do the Father's will; it is natural for us not to do it. For us the Father's will is not, as it was for Jesus, a power working within us; it is rather a power working over us, even against us. There is something within us that rebels against it. That something is sin. And sin is defiance of God's will. It is rebellion against God.

We also need a far more realistic emphasis in our preaching on the solidarity of sin, the thought of corporate responsibility and corporate guilt. After all, responsibility is never exclusively individual. If I am my brother's keeper, it goes without saying that I am in some sense responsible for his sins. His guilt is also my guilt. The reader may recall that the Pope underscored this thought in his 1943 Christmas message. After calling attention to the painful disillusionment of those who once put their trust in the characteristic follies of our modern life, economic expansion, Godless science, and simple sensuality, he asked solemnly, "Is there anyone who has a right to say that he is blameless?"[5]

In this way it should be relatively easy for us to help our

4 *Amiel's Journal*, translated by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, p. 14.
5 Reported in *The New York Times*, December 25, 1943.

people to see that we are all guilty before God, that we have all incurred a debt to Him which we cannot repay. And it is vitally important that we make this matter real to them; for, as Chesterton has pointed out in one of the most meaningful of all his paradoxes, the man who knows that he cannot repay his debt will always be seeking to repay it.[6] The man whose conscience has been sensitized through fellowship with Jesus Christ realizes that he has incurred a debt which he cannot repay, but out of gratitude for his deliverance he throws himself heart and soul into a valiant effort to repay it. Thus this old gospel of repentance and forgiveness becomes a powerful incentive to right living; it is clearly a part of the plan which God has devised to cleanse us from all unrighteousness and prepare us for fellowship with Himself.

The writer has included this point at the risk of seeming to be carrying coals to Newcastle. He has included it because he believes that we have solid reason to be concerned lest, after the present crisis has run its course, man will return to his former ways and begin once more to worship himself. Even in the midst of the crisis he seems to be planning a world from which God is to be excluded. It is confidently predicted that the world of tomorrow will be a strange new world, with all sorts of gadgets that will make work superfluous and life one grand round of pleasure for us all. Even the weather is to be controlled. We used to believe that God had something to do with the weather. It would seem that that was just another silly superstition. Man is going to make the weather to suit his whims! So these silly prophets would have us believe.

Now that is only a parable, but it is a parable that should give us pause. Why is it that, with all this talk about the world of tomorrow, we hear so little talk about God? Is He again to be excluded from it? Well, we know that as long as He is excluded, the same old tragedy will be re-enacted over and over again until man has destroyed himself. Our hope lies, not in a revamped and refurbished humanism, but in the honest realism of this old gospel of sin and grace and the power of Jesus Christ to transform human life.

6 Cf. H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, p. 115.

A Gospel for Saints

Our people need this emphasis on repentance and forgiveness, however, not only because they are sinners, but also because they are saints. "There are only two kinds of men," declares Pascal, "the righteous who believe themselves sinners; the rest, sinners, who believe themselves righteous."[7] The saints, that is, the sinners who believe themselves righteous, stand in special need of this emphasis; for, as President J. S. Whale puts it, "There is no sin so subtly dangerous as the self-sufficiency of the morally religious man."[8] The danger is brought out most impressively in the story of little Jonathan in Lloyd Douglas' popular novel, *The Robe*. When little Jonathan gave his new donkey, the pride and joy of his heart, to another crippled boy, his friends put forth every effort to see to it that he was not praised for his self-sacrifice. "There is no vanity so damaging to a man's character," observed one of them, "as pride over his good deeds." That, in part, is what we mean in our traditional theologies when we say that our good deeds are but filthy rags. Our righteousness is always tainted. Our humility is tainted with pride, our sincerity with hypocrisy, our good deeds with self-interest and self-esteem.

This melancholy outcome of our striving is closely related to our failure to take it in that the only real world is the world that has Jesus Christ as its center and its circumference. In our conceit we put ourselves instead of our God at the center, and then we have the effrontery to label the world so conceived, this fiction of the mind of man, as the only real world. That is the beginning of our fall. Our fundamental sin is Narcissism, preoccupation with self, or, to use the current phrase, egocentricity, the tendency to think of the world of which we are the center as the only real world. It is a sin which no man can overcome by his own efforts. As Professor John Baillie has pointed out, we cannot conquer the pride that is in our hearts without becoming secretly proud of our conquest of pride. We bravely set out to master this new

7 Cf. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, Vol. I, p. 257.
8 *Christian Doctrine*, p. 39.

secret pride, only to find ourselves secretly exulting in this new conquest of pride. And so on indefinitely. Professor Baillie tells of a Sunday School teacher who is said to have closed a lesson on the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican with these words: "And now, children, let us thank God that we are not as this Pharisee was!"[9] Thus our very piety is vitiated at the start by our egocentricity, our preoccupation with self. Man sets out to make of himself a God, only to find that he has become a Satan. In his remorse he then sets out to make of himself a worm, only to find that he has become a very proud worm, a very conceited worm, exulting in his very wormhood! This constitutes man's tragic dilemma. Obviously the remedy lies, not in human effort but in capitulation, unconditional surrender, if you please. It lies in our according to Jesus Christ his rightful place in the center of our world, acknowledging our dependence upon Him, making His interests our interests, His goal our goal, His will the dominating passion of our lives. And that is repentance. From this point of view the process could be depicted under the figure of two circles. Man is the center of the one circle, Jesus Christ is the center of the other. In the Christian life as we have interpreted it, the two circles overlap a bit but they are by no means concentric. Our problem, or, rather, God's problem, is to make them concentric. And it is a problem worthy of a God—to bring us self-centered sinners to the point where we realize that the only real world is the world that has Jesus Christ as its center and its circumference.

The Road to Freedom

There is one other thought that makes this gospel of repentance and forgiveness particularly relevant to our times. Repentance is the road to freedom. It is the road to freedom because it is the road to reconciliation with God. Professor Reinhold Niebuhr has pointed out that, "As freedom develops, both good

9 *Invitation to Pilgrimage*, p. 60.

and evil develop with it."[10] The present writer is prepared to carry the thought a step further: "'As freedom develops, both good and evil develop with it.' Then, if the evil is permitted to go unchecked, the freedom is lost, and along with the freedom, all the good." Our task as Christian citizens is so to use our freedom that only good will grow out of it. If we permit it to lead us in the opposite direction, we shall most certainly lose it.

Unfortunately most of us have a bird-in-the-cage conception of freedom. Like foolish birds we beat against the bars, forgetting that we are not birds, forgetting that even if the bird succeeds in breaking through the bars, he is not necessarily free. He immediately finds himself subject to the law of the hawk. He finds that he must obey this new law or he will soon be, not merely the hawk's slave, but also the hawk's victim. So with all man's efforts to win his freedom by kicking over the traces. That process can only lead to new servitude, because there is no tyranny comparable to the awful tyranny of sin. There is an old saying, "Give the devil an inch and he will take a yard." That is a good illustration of the superb eloquence of understatement. Give the devil an inch and he will take everything. In serving Satan we lose our freedom and become his slaves, the slaves of our sins.

There is only one way out of this dilemma: repentance, not remorse, which Professor Niebuhr calls "the expression of freedom without faith," but repentance, which he characterizes as "the expression of freedom and faith"[11]—the repentance that leads to reconciliation. For consider what happens when a sinner has been reconciled to God in Christ. He now finds his highest and deepest joy, therefore also his highest and deepest freedom, in trying to live as children of God ought to live. On this new level of life and being, restraints are no longer restraints, controls no longer controls. To refrain from harming one's neighbor is no longer a limitation of one's freedom. The child of God loves his neighbors, all his neighbors, and therefore never even dreams of harming them. Thus love takes the place of law, and

10 Reinhold Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 95.
11 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 255.

where love abounds freedom also abounds. The man who has been reconciled to God in Christ has only one aim and passion in life and that is to live as God would have him live. And you can turn such a man loose in any society; you need not hem him in with restraints and controls. He is a free man. He has heard God's call to repentance, has been reconciled to God in Christ, has set out on this holy pilgrimage from the mind of the flesh to the mind of Christ.

The writer wishes once more to call attention to the purpose of this article. It was written, not with a view to suggesting a revision of our theology of repentance, but in the hope that it would be of some help to our pastors in their preaching and teaching. Our theology of repentance is basically sound; our pastors need but have its implications brought to their attention now and then and they will do what they can to correct current misunderstandings of the doctrine.

A REVIEW OF THE TRADITIONAL LUTHERAN POSITION ON THE LORD'S SUPPER

C. B. GOHDES
Columbus, Ohio

SOMEWHAT portentous is the rather frequent appearance of articles and tracts in defense of the traditional Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper. It is the response of ultra-conservatives to the restiveness which has made itself felt in regard to the traditional formulation of the doctrine of the Holy Sacrament. The core of this Lutheran dogma is indeed not in dispute. The Real Presence is not questioned. It is the process of reasoning whereby the traditional theology aims to prevent the degradation of the sacrament to a mere symbol which no longer commands the unanimous support it once did. To be specific, modern Lutheran critics of the traditional formulation of the dogma of the Holy Supper hold that the core of their dogma is found in the seventh article of the *Solida Declaratio* of the Formula of Concord, where it is taught that Christ is present in the sacrament, to be spiritually received, and that the idea of a coarse, material presence and a Capernaitic reception of His body and blood is to be rejected. Christ Himself present in the Holy Supper: there is the Real Presence. The weakness of the traditional formulation of this doctrine, however, is that it is so worded and argumentatively implemented as to express the idea of consubstantiation and to connote the very Capernaitic eating and drinking which it reprobates.

Every Lutheran teacher of history notes regretfully the reaction of historians to the Lutheran sacramental dogma. As they put it, Romanism stands for transubstantiation; Calvinism, for the representative character of the sacramental elements and a spiritual reception of Christ; Lutheranism, for consubstantiation. They are not partisan assailants of the Lutheran dogma. They are humanists utterly neutral, at times too much so. They want

to be impartial recorders. Consubstantiation is all they can read out of the language of the Lutheran formularies, an attitude for which they cannot be blamed in view of the wording and argumentation used in them.

Equally conspicuous is the puzzlement of the dictionary makers. Webster, unmindful of protests from outstanding Lutherans, in the past defined consubstantiation as the Lutheran position on the Lord's Supper. Increasing protests from Lutheran sources have not produced an unequivocal retraction; they have produced a noncommittal attitude. Consubstantiation is now defined as "the actual, substantial presence of the body of Christ with the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper; impanation, a doctrine attributed to Lutherans but repudiated by them." Now, it is to be observed that language in which our Lutheran Confessions posit the Real Presence is such as to denote consubstantiation, is such as to express not only a corporeal eating and drinking of "the true and essential body and blood of Christ," but to make this corporeal eating and drinking the central feature of the doctrine rather than the communion established by the Sacrament between the believer and the Christ of the Cross, present in the sacrament; that is, the intent is vitiated by words in contradiction to it.

That this failure to balance the truth intended to be taught and the method of teaching it causes restiveness at this particular time, is not to be wondered at. In literature, the present age has developed the science of semantics, a use of words characterized by such clarity as to dispense with the necessity of explanation. But apparently some parts of the Lutheran Confessions need explanations of the explanation. Irking to those who appreciate plain language! Words that, literally understood, denote consubstantiation so forcibly that historians and dictionary makers cannot make anything else out of them have no claim to endorsement; nor have processes of reasoning which lead to conclusions clashing with the main thesis. The writer accepts with all his heart the plan of salvation as laid down in the Confessions, inclusive of the dogma of the Real Presence. However, he maintains the right to reject as a *non-sequitur* inapplicable quotations from the Scriptures and irrelevant processes of reasoning.

I. The Phraseology of the Confessions Examined

First of all, it behooves us to examine the traditional teaching of the Lutheran Church in regard to the doctrine of the Holy Supper in order to show that the negative side, viz., the denial of consubstantiation and of a consequent material eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, is not borne out by the positive side. In other words, we cannot blame the historians and dictionary makers for finding, in our Lutheran dogma of the Holy Supper, consubstantiation and a literal, material eating and drinking of that for which, according to the intent of the divine Founder, the bread and wine are intended to serve as vehicle, that is, the body and blood of Christ.

We may begin our investigation with the catechism. In the one in use in the circles of the writer,[1] question 254 reads, "What do we receive in this sacrament?" The answer is the one traditional in the Lutheran Church: "Bread and wine; and in, with and under the bread and wine we receive the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." The proof passage is I Cor. 10:16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" etc. Scholars will agree that Webster's definition of consubstantiation is to the point: "The actual *substantial* presence of the body of Christ with the bread and wine of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." The Lutheran Church repudiates, not this definition of consubstantiation, but consubstantiation itself. But if the body of Christ be "in, with, and under" the bread, and the blood of Christ be "in, with, and under" the wine, what is that but consubstantiation? If the Lutheran Church repudiates (as it does) the "actual substantial presence with the body of Christ," that is, consubstantiation, not only are the words "in, with, and under" ill chosen for their purposes, but they confuse minds and hearts when the attempt is made to qualify words by denuding them of the meaning they evidently possess. The *con* in consubstantiation is the Latin *cum,* which means "with." It is undeniable, accordingly, that the word "with"

1 *Senior Catechism,* by J. A. Dell.

conveys a meaning we repudiate, viz., the actual, substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine. The Formula of Concord repudiates the view that there is an inclusion of Christ's body and blood in the bread and wine (impanation); nevertheless it is taught there that the body and blood of Christ are *in* the bread and wine. But what does this preposition denote if not inclusion?

How confusing the continued use of archaic and irrelevant phraseology is, can be inferred from the latest book dealing with the Lutheran Confessions, *Lutheran Confessional Theology*,[2] bearing in the form of a well-written introduction the endorsement of the St. Louis scholar Theodore Graebner. Using the traditional phraseology and mode of reasoning in setting forth the doctrine of the Holy Supper as taught in Article X of the Augustana, the author makes an astounding statement regarding the condemnatory clause of the article in question—"And they reject those that teach otherwise." This statement, at which Lutheran Americans living in the present may well take umbrage, is: "While this includes both Romanists and the Reformed, the disapproval is directed chiefly against the latter, whose offense in rejecting the heavenly objects is graver than that of the Roman Church in rejecting the earthly elements through which the heavenly objects are conveyed." That the Augustana had a diplomatic bias in being so formulated as to make the designed impression that there was more agreement between the Lutherans and the Catholics than between themselves and the Reformed, is a weakness of that venerable document which there is certainly no reason to project into the present. It is conceded that Zwingli, to whom the Holy Sacrament signified less than a striking picture of the crucifixion, largely defrauded himself and his adherents of the specific blessing which to convey the sacrament had been instituted. Nevertheless Zwingli retained the Gospel in its essential features, while Rome, perverting the sacrament into a sacerdotal sacrifice, prostituted it by commercializing it in the form of the mass, for which, moreover, the blasphemous claim

2 By C. H. Little. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1943.

is made that it shuts purgatory and opens heaven. The Roman mass is the negation of the Gospel. It is indeed time to re-examine words the upholding of which prompt a Lutheran professor to enunciate a view which rates the outrageous Roman doctrine of transubstantiation higher than the corresponding dogmas of the Reformed churches which do not even bear the superficial character of the Zwinglian doctrine.

The Real Presence is, of course, taught in the Formula of Concord. We read (Chapter VII of the *Solida Declaratio*):

> There is, therefore, a twofold eating of the flesh of Christ, one *spiritual,* of which Christ treats especially John 6:54, which occurs in no other way than with the Spirit and faith, in the preaching and mediation of the Gospel, as well as in the Lord's Supper, and by itself is useful and salutary, and necessary at all times for salvation to all Christians; without which spiritual participation also the sacramental or oral eating in the Supper is not only not salutary, but even injurious and damning [a cause of condemnation].
>
> But this spiritual eating is nothing else than *faith,* namely, to hear God's Word (wherein Christ, true God and man, is presented to us, together with all benefits which he has purchased for us by His flesh given into death for us, and by His blood shed for us, namely, God's grace, the forgiveness of sins, righteousness, and eternal life), to receive it with faith and appropriate it to ourselves, and in all troubles and temptations firmly to rely, with sure confidence and trust, and to abide in the consolation that we have a gracious God and eternal salvation on account of the Lord Jesus Christ, etc.[3]

Christ present in the Holy Supper, as He is present in the Word and Baptism, and received savingly in faith, so that the Sacrament of the Altar becomes the means whereby the Kingdom is covenanted to the disciples; that is, to all poor sinners who grasp Him as the pardoner and the healer of sin: there is the essence of the sacrament. Thus explained, repentance is called for and faith, and Christian fellowship is the result. The heart is filled by grace through such teaching, and the mind is not burdened and confused with specious, metaphysical reasoning. Never-

3 Here (p. 989) and elsewhere the writer has used the English rendering of the St. Louis *Concordia Triglotta.* Small caps are used by the writer. Italics in *Triglotta.*

theless, the Formula of Concord is not satisfied with thus positing the Real Presence as a spiritual fact and factor; but it lays chief emphasis upon a literalism enlarged upon by speculation when it holds that "the true and essential body and blood of Christ" are conveyed, not to the soul but *to the mouth,* "in, with, and under" the material elements of bread and wine. Let the Formula of Concord speak for itself:

> The other eating of the body and blood of Christ is *oral* or *sacramental* when THE TRUE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST are also ORALLY received and partaken of in the Holy Supper, by all who eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine in the Supper, etc. . . . For in view of the circumstances this command[4] evidently cannot be understood otherwise than of oral eating and drinking, however, not in a gross, carnal, Capernaitic, but in a supernatural, incomprehensible way.[5]

This is the way the Formula of Concord posits the Real Presence. We are held to believe that, as the bread and the wine are partaken of, the true body and blood of Christ, conveyed in, with, and under the bread and wine, are partaken of with the mouth, with this difference that, unlike the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are not masticated and digested, but are eaten and drunk in a supernatural, incomprehensible way. There is a speculative element in this explanation of the oral eating and drinking. Everything hinges on the question, "What is meant by Christ's body and blood? There can be no question that the Lord's Supper, as given to the disciples, differs in no essential sense from that given to us today if its institutional character be preserved. If we receive His "true" body and blood today (note that the adjective is extra-biblical), so did the disciples. If they received, and we receive today, *with the mouth,* not only the bread and wine but also the "true" body and blood of Christ, what right have we to posit a twofold gustatory and metabolic reaction of our bodily organs in holding that the bread and wine are subject to the metabolic process, while the "true" body and

4 Eat and drink.
5 *Triglotta,* p. 989.

blood of Christ are withdrawn from it? Begging indulgence for postponing for the present the discussion of the meaning of the body and blood of Christ in connection with the Holy Sacrament, we go to the Formula of Concord to ascertain the meaning of the term peculiar to this Confession.

> Thus we, too, are simply to believe with all humility and obedience the plain, firm, clear, and solemn words and command of our Creator and Redeemer, without any doubt and disputation as to how it agrees with our reason or how it is possible. For these words were spoken by *that Lord* who is infinite Wisdom and Truth itself, and also can execute and accomplish everything which He promises.
>
> Now, all the circumstances of the institution of the Holy Supper testify that these words of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, which in themselves are simple, plain, clear, firm, and indubitable, cannot and must not be understood otherwise than in their usual, proper, and common signification. For since Christ gives this command [concerning eating His body, etc.] at the table and at supper, there is indeed no doubt that He speaks of real, natural bread, and of natural wine, also of oral eating and drinking, so that there can be no metaphor, that is, a change of meaning, in the word *bread,* AS THOUGH THE BODY OF CHRIST WERE A SPIRITUAL BREAD OR A SPIRITUAL FOOD OF SOULS. Likewise, also Christ Himself takes care that there be no metonymy either, that is, that in the same manner there be no change of meaning in the word *body*, and that He does not speak concerning a sign of His body, or concerning an emblem [a symbol] or figurative body, or concerning the virtue of His body and the benefits which He has earned by the sacrifice of His body [for us], but of HIS TRUE, ESSENTIAL BODY, which He delivered into death for us, and of HIS TRUE, ESSENTIAL BLOOD, which He shed for us on the tree [altar] of the cross for the remission of sins.[6]

The matter is not quite so simple as it appeared to the authors of our Confession. For one thing, every disciple of Jesus Christ is such because he believes "with all humility and obedience the plain, firm, clear, and solemn words and command of our Creator and Redeemer, without any doubt and disputation as to how it agrees with our reason or is possible." But the writer submits that the authors of the Formula of Concord did

6 *Concordia Triglotta,* p. 989. Small caps by the writer. Italics in *Triglotta.*

not "reck their own rede." They hold that the words Jesus spoke to His disciples must be understood literally: that is, that He gave to them His *true, essential body and blood* while He kept His body perfectly intact in keeping every drop of His blood in His arteries and every vestige of flesh upon His bones. Is it not realized that the "true, essential" body of Christ, as that of a true man, comprised not only His flesh but also His sinews, arteries, bones, gristle, not to incur the charge of irreverence by mentioning other parts of the human body? The authors of the Formula of Concord, moreover, when they animadvert upon a metonymous or metaphorical interpretation of the words "body" and "blood," take no less liberty with the Master's words than those who would make these words out to be a symbolism. Christ is quoted as saying: "This *is* my body"; "this *is* my blood." The Romanists take this literally, rationalizing their procedure under the name of transubstantiation (and of what a host of blasphemies and superstitions their coarse literalism has been made the mother!). The authors of the Formula of Concord, on the other hand, take the word "is" no more literally than the Calvinists; for they hold (rightly enough) that the bread is *not* the body of Christ, nor the wine the blood of Christ, but that the bread and the wine are vehicles for the body and blood of Christ. Calling the connection between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ a "sacramental union" does not meet the difficulty incurred when the word "is" is disposed of as signifying "in, with, and under." If "is" can be understood to mean "convey," with full faith in the Master's words, so can the interpretation that the bread broken by Christ and the wine distributed by Him convey Christ Himself as the life of our life, carefully avoiding a metaphysical disquisition of the union. Metaphysical disquisitions of God's mysteries will soon or late be challenged.

Nor have the authors of the Formula of Concord been quite successful in their philology when they force a meaning upon the words of St. Paul (I Cor. 10) which these do not necessarily possess. " 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is

it not the communion of the body of Christ?' is to be considered with all diligence and seriousness [accurately], as an especially clear testimony of the true, essential presence and distribution of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper."[7] I disagree. The word rendered "communion" is *koinonia*. Philology does not bear out the contention that the word *koinonia*, as used by Paul, necessitates an interpretation according to which the "true and essential" body and blood of Christ must be present in, with, and under the bread and wine. A selection of a few quotations from the many available must suffice. In Plato, we come upon the phrase: *He peri anthropous pros allelous koinonia.* This merely means "the association among men with each other." Plato speaks also of marriage as *haute he koinonia.* The meaning is "this partnership." Liddell and Scott, illustrating the diverse meanings of *koinonia,* quote the phrase, *tis thalasses boukolois koinonia?* The question is the equivalent of the proposition that there is no intercourse between country folk and the sea. Nor does Holy Scripture itself bear the fathers of the Form of Concord out in foisting their specific sense upon the words of St. Paul in I Cor. 10, 16. In Hebrews 13, 16, we read: *Tes de eupoias kai koinonias me epilanthanesthe.* The writer of the Hebrews thus exhorts the objects of his solicitude not to forget welldoing and sharing. Classical as well as biblical usage justifies the rendering of *koinonia* by association, which is quite another thing than one substance being "in, with, and under" another, and without consubstantiation at that. It is not, therefore, unbiblical and, therefore, not un-Lutheran to hold that the Real Presence in the Holy Communion is not lost when one holds that, as the mouth receives the consecrated elements of bread and wine, Christ Himself is present, to assure the penitent recipient of the forgiveness of sin, to covenant to him the Kingdom, and to feed his soul.

This interpretation requires neither metaphysical speculation for proof nor forced philology. It is based upon the Word. It is the correlate in noble simplicity of all that constitutes Gospel—

7 *Concordia Triglotta,* p. 991.

the need of repentance, the atonement by the sin-bearer Christ, faith as a vitalizing power grasping both the forgiveness of sin and the healing remedy. It is in keeping with the mentality of the humble men through whom God's revelation was given and with that of the average mortal to whom the Gospel makes its appeal. It does not smack of sophistication. It satisfies the heart because it shows Jesus only.

II. The Holy Supper Examined in Its Scriptural Setting

I have endeavored to show that the weakness of the Formula of Concord consists in emphasizing a speculative element rather than the fact of clear revelation to which faith clings: that the essence of the Sacrament is the presence of Christ assuring His disciple of forgiveness, of His covenanted Kingdom, and of food for the soul through imparting Himself to the recipient. What the Confession, on the other hand, emphasizes is a severely speculative element, viz., that "the true, essential body and blood" of Christ are received with the mouth, without, at the same time, retaining the characteristics of true, essential flesh and blood, namely, to become subject to the process of metabolism like the substances, bread and wine, in, with, and under which they are held to be imparted without, at the same time, being consubstantiated with them; but that the "true, essential body and blood" are partaken of by the human body in a supernatural, heavenly, though, nevertheless, real manner. Such speculation could never have originated in the present age. It is a hangover of the scholastic age, a barnacle on the truth rather than its constituent. To obtain the significance of the words of institution, it is necessary to consider them, not as an isolated pericope, but in their vital connection with the whole plan of salvation as revealed in Scripture, Old Testament as well as New.

A striking fact disclosed by the words of institution is that the four accounts differ.[8] Matthew makes the Lord say: "Take eat:

8 The explanation of this fact is simple. Christ spoke Aramaic, and the several apostles used their own judgment in translating His words.

this is my body; drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament shed in behalf of many for the forgiveness of sins." According to Mark, the Lord said: "Take, this is my body; this is my blood of the New Testament, shed for many." Mark uses the preposition *hyper* in connection with the cup, while Matthew uses *peri*. Luke makes Jesus say: "This is my body given for you; this do in remembrance of me; this cup is the New Testament in my blood, shed for you." Paul reports Jesus as saying: "This is my body for you"—the verb being left out[9]—"do this in remembrance of me; this cup is the New Testament in my blood; do this as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me."

Some scholars hold that Luke's account, with which Paul's is in essential agreement, is based on the oldest record.[10]

While this conclusion may be disputed, it is proper to accept the principle that when several passages refer to the same subject, the clearer one should be the key to the more obscure one. The significance of the holy rite instituted by Christ thus becomes readily apparent: it is the new testament or covenant, in His blood procured by the shedding of His blood. The Saviour covenants to the recipients of the sacrament His kingdom together with the irremissible qualification for it—riddance from sin by forgiveness. This covenent is based upon the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, whose body was broken in death for us, whose blood was shed for us. Into His presence the sacrament thus brings those who partake of it. The reception of Himself with the blessings He wrought for us when His body was broken in death for us, when His blood was shed for us, when thus His life was given as a ransom for many: that is the real presence which does not require the mystifying, mind-baffling theological speculation of *Christ's real, essential body and blood being received with the mouth.* The new testament, or covenant, in Christ's blood is founded on His death—His broken body and shed blood—not on the eating and drinking of that body and blood *with the mouth.*

This interpretation of the Holy Sacrament as a means

9 For the verb "broken" in I Cor. II we are indebted to the translators.
10 Rudolf Otto, *Reich Gottes and Menschensohn,* pp. 227 ff.

whereby the servant of Jehovah communicates the blessings secured by His death is prefigured in Holy Writ by the prophets, none more so than Isaiah.

> He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; . . . he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. . . . By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors. . . . For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee.

There is the prophecy of what occurred on Calvary, and the Holy Communion is the distribution of the Calvary blessings, not the distribution of its blood. "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me" (Luke 22:29).

But do we not, by questioning the "in, with, and under" theory according to which the "real, essential" body and blood of Christ are received through the mouth, teach a merely spiritual eating and drinking? We do; only we would not associate the adverb "merely" with a verb designating the enjoyment of the Real Presence. The spiritual eating and drinking, repudiated in the Formula of Concord for historic controversial reasons,[11] is certainly the key to the sacramental mystery according to St. John. "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:53, 54). The traditional Lutheran theology denies that

11 Lutheran solidarity was to be attained through the precise demarcation of the Lutheran from the Reformed and Catholic dogmas respectively.

this passage refers to the sacrament. The technical objection that the Holy Sacrament was celebrated at the end of Christ's career, while these words were spoken at the very height of it gives plausibility to the objection, though it is not conclusive. The holy writers do not strictly observe the chronological method. John anticipated the cleansing of the temple likewise, though, according to the other apostles, it took place not long before His passion. St. Luke splits the account of the first celebration of Holy Communion by making Christ's reproof to Judas and His warning of the ambitious disciples a part of His discourse during the celebration of the Holy Supper, whereas the other apostles state that these warnings were spoken before the Holy Supper was instituted. The apostles do not pretend to chronicle the events of the Saviour's earthly career *consecutively,* but combine them freely to suit some particular purpose. Substituting for the *soma* (body) of the other apostles the word *sarx* (flesh), John uses otherwise the identical phraseology. To hold that the same language must be taken literally when the institution of the Holy Supper is described, but metaphorically in John 6, so as to deduce the meaning that faith, in its ultimate meaning, is the penetration of our life by Christ's, is not to follow Scripture but to foist upon it an *a priori* significance. Whatever the meaning of "flesh" and "blood" is in John 6, 53-54, that is their meaning in the pericopes dealing with Holy Communion elsewhere, on the principle that the simpler passage is the key to those more obscure. The real reason why St. John is not allowed to shed light upon the meaning of the Holy Sacrament is that, if he is received as a witness relative to the true significance of the holy rite, the speculative conception of the reception of the "true, essential" body and blood of Christ *"with the mouth"* is proved untenable and the reception of Christ, present in the sacrament as the life of our life, is established as its essential meaning. Instead of counting John out as an interpreter of the holy rite, this great theologian and recorder of the spiritual features of Christ's career should be hailed as the provider of the key to its meaning. As the writer sees the connection between the Johannine reference

to the eating of Christ's body and blood and the identical phraseology of the Synoptics, the latter stress the blessings of the sacrament as due to the atoning death of the servant of Jehovah, whereas St. John enables us to envisage the result of the sacrament—the feeding of the recipient by faith upon Christ Himself—interpretations mutually complementary. The Real Presence, the Sacramental Union, is indeed a mystery which only intellectual pride would seek to explain away. But it is surely no lack of reverence to hold that the reception of Christ Himself at the sacred tryst before the altar between the soul and its Redeemer is the height of the solemn occasion.

Our conclusion has been based upon the assumption that St. John, in the sixth chapter, though using the identical words used by the synoptics in connection with the Holy Supper, does not refer to the holy rite. This assumption, however, is by no means the only one possible. It is not precluded that St. John does refer to the Holy Supper. Should we prefer the latter interpretation, we can understand why John does not refer to the sacrament in connection with its institution in the starless night of treason, but rather makes it a salient moment of the Saviour's career at its height. Whether Christ comes to the disciple over the bridge of the Word or at the sacred tryst at the altar, the interpretation of our life with that of Christ is the most blessed fruitage of faith and its severest test. Our life penetrated by that of Christ means salvation achieved. For that reason Jesus gives Himself to us in the Holy Supper.

But there is the "is" of St. Paul and the synoptics. However forcibly one may feel the anticlimactic character of the thesis that, in, with, and under the bread and wine, the "true and essential body and blood of Christ" are present, to be received with the mouth, in a real, albeit incomprehensible manner—anticlimactic when one visualizes in faith the broken body and the shed blood of Christ as the source whence the sacrament draws its blessing and the living Christ who has pledged His presence—there is still the "is" to be reckoned with. It has already been stated that this verb is not dealt with in the usual manner when,

in the "in, with, and under" theory, it is taken as the equivalent of "convey." I repeat that it is no more strictly literal to hold that through the bread and wine the body and blood, real and essential, are conveyed to the mouth than to hold that they convey the blessings secured by Christ's death on Calvary and the enrichment of the inner life through the reception in faith of the blessings secured by them. If Christ is to be understood in strict literalness, the elements he hands to His disciples *are* simply His body and blood. In that case the Romanist would be right, and truth would be synonymous with absurdity. But there is light in Scripture by which we are not left to our own devices in the premises.

The phraseology of our Saviour can clearly be integrated with a type of expression peculiar to prophetic usage, the *drastic* (from the Greek *drao*) prediction; that is, a prophecy in the form of a symbolical act. Breaking the bread, distributing the wine, the Saviour predicts by means of an act His atoning death, the blessings of which He communicates in the case of the apostles by anticipation. Philology renders us, in this connection, invaluable aid. According to Dalmann, the words of institution are: *den hu gufi.*[12] These Aramaic words are, according to the authority quoted, idiomatic. Their meaning is: this is myself. The broken bread is to symbolize Christ's body, presently to be broken in death. Similar is the significance of the wine.

This method of setting forth the meaning of the sacrament is by no means singular; it is typical. Thus the prophet Ezekiel (ch. 4) symbolizes by a drastic prediction the fate of Jewry. A tile with the city portrayed upon it, with a fort against it, and a mount against it, and a camp against it, and encircling battering-rams against it: thus the destiny of the Jewish people was to be portrayed. With this symbol is linked another. He was to take an iron pan and lay it between himself and the city. Against this he was to set his face and to lay siege to it. This done, he was to lay upon the models of the wicked city Israel's sin and lie upon

12 Rudolf Otto, *Reich Gottes and Menschensohn,* pp. 253 ff.

his left side and bear, by substitutive suffering, the iniquity of the people.

An even clearer example of drastic prediction we find in Jeremiah 19. The people having sinned against the Lord by reversion to gross idolatry, the prophet was to proceed with the elders of the city to the east gate, there to charge them with their iniquity and to proclaim their doom. Breaking a bottle in the sight of the elders, he was to say: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts; even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that can not be made whole again."

The connection between the several acts of the prophet and the institution of the Holy Supper thus becomes clear. Christ, prophet as well as high priest and king, uses a type of conveying truth which has been sanctified by hoary prophetic usage—drastic prediction; that is, prophecy by means of an act. As the vessel broken by Jeremiah is, in drastic prediction, the doomed Jerusalem, so the bread and wine in the hands of Christ, in drastic prediction, is Himself, about to give His life a ransom for many through His passion and death. A wondrous symbolism this; but more than a symbolism: an actual impartation to faith of the kingdom with its blessings, forgiveness, and an empowerment of the life hidden with Christ in God. A realm of joy and power thus opens its portals to the suppliant at the altar, but when reason has done its utmost to clarify the sacramental mystery, it is for faith to feast upon what reason finds unfathomable and inexpressible. Of this we may be sure: the metaphysical feature of the communion dogma, the reception of the true and essential body and blood of Christ, in, with, and under the bread and wine with the mouth, safeguarded from metabolic transformation, as it were, by being eaten and drunk in a real, albeit incomprehensible, manner, is no help to faith but at best an intellectual cyst, a harmless literalism; at worst, material for scholastic sublety. It is not needed to substantiate the Real Presence.

Why a More Liberal Exposition of the Communion Dogma?

The position here taken on the communion dogma, reduced to briefest terms, is accordingly as follows: The emphasis should

be placed not on a theological deduction regarding what constitutes the sacrament—"the true and essential body and blood of Christ received with the mouth"—but on the clear teaching of Scripture that the sacrament links the communicant to the Calvary cross with the atoning Christ thereon, whose body is broken, whose blood is shed in death for us; and that, where this union is consummated by faith, Christ is received—an experience attested by believers throughout the world as a replenishment of the soul's life. That the human body, through the mouth, receives the "true and essential body and blood of Christ" while assimilating through the process of metabolism only the vehicle that conveys them, the bread and wine, is a *theologoumenon,* a metaphysical proposition which should not be *central* in the explanation of the Holy Supper. The Real Presence is not conditioned by the "in, with, and under" literalism. Christ is there; the fruits of Calvary are there. Through the sacrament they are conveyed. Speculation regarding the method should not be an article of faith.

But do we not, by this change of emphasis, break with the venerable Confessions of the Church of the Reformation? Hardly. No intelligent Lutheran will today refuse recognition to a brother who registers his lack of faith in the Confessional agreement with the Roman dogma of Mary's perpetual virginity or his refusal to find *the* Anti-Christ of the Bible in the Roman pontiff. Why, then, should one lose his standing as a Lutheran for refusing to make his own a method of reasoning so beset with contradictions as to demolish the very thesis it is framed to sustain?

We have seen Luther quoted with approval anent the Real Presence when it is clear that the correct position he took, and which we take with him, over against Zwingli at Marburg in 1529 is weakened rather than strengthened by his argument.[13] What he proposed to Zwingli was this: "The Lord's body is present essentially and substantially, *but not qualitatively or quantitatively or locally.*" Anyone conversant with the Aristotelian maxim, true today as it was in the pagan philosopher's day, that the mind cannot hold to two mutually exclusive concepts, will ask himself,

13 *American Lutheran,* May, 1943, p. 8.

How can the Lord's body be *essentially* and *substantially* present when it is *quantitatively, qualitatively,* and *locally* absent? Yet the attempt is made to project such inconclusive reasoning into the present when the not dissimilar reasoning of the Formula of Concord is foisted upon the modern Lutheran.

Emphatically, faith only profits by the discarding of obsolete arguments which merely raise new difficulties for the inquirer. Applying the evident meaning of John 6:53, 54 as key to that of the words of institution (no doubt spoken in Aramaic, and hence rendered diversely by the apostles who recorded the institution of the Holy Sacrament), we visualize not an act completed once for all and merely calling for repetition throughout the era of grace, in which the celebrant, be he priest or minister, is the principal agent, but rather one in which the present giver of life, the author of our salvation, Jesus Christ Himself, is the principal agent, whose power to give and to bless is subject to but one limitation, our ability and willingness to receive.

The Roman practice of treating the sacrament as magic, relieving *ex opere operato* the communicant from his sins, has been denounced with sufficient vehemence and frequency, if that be possible. There is reason to think that but too many Lutherans occupy a standpoint not much higher. There came a time in Luther's life when, instead of pleading participation, he counseled abstention! Nor are we sure that the same practice is not called for today. It has certainly been the experience of this writer that the annual communion enjoined by Rome is also the self-imposed practice of vast hosts of Lutherans who go to the altar at Easter-time, thinking that the reception of the blessing automatically accompanies the reception of the elements, and this in spite of the precautions taken by means of catechetical instruction, the confessional service, and announcement for communion. The placing of emphasis on the presence of the Lord of life at Holy Communion rather than on a metaphysical argumentation regarding the manner of receiving His body and blood and the attempt at a precise definition of the latter is better calculated to produce the state of heart receptive of the life pledged by Christ.

Placing the emphasis on the present Christ as operative in the sacrament rather than on arguments intended to instruct the reason regarding the manner in which His body and blood are communicated to the soul through the mouth, will also safeguard against another misconception, the making of doctrinal correctness rather than the spiritual qualifications of hatred of sin and hunger for righteousness the feature on which most stress is laid. If the position taken by the writer is correct, there is reason to doubt the right often taken of denying that those of another affiliation have the sacramental blessing because they do not go the same length with Lutherans in demonstrating how the Real Presence is brought about. The feeding on Christ Himself is not determined primarily by dogmatic positiveness and consistency but by the hunger and thirst for righteousness, by the depth of repentance, and by the desire to receive the blessing and the power of the living Christ. Where hunger of the soul for Christ as the living truth rather than concern about concepts constitutes the emphasis in the Christian's attitude toward the sacrament, there will be a crescendo of power and peace flowing from the communion altar quite in contrast to the meager experience of those for whom communion means principally a body of divisive doctrines and a ceremonial practice without hatred for sin and love's passionate glow for the Redeemer and the redeemed. To repeat: the experience of the vitamin of grace depends rather on hunger for it than on a philosophical theory regarding it.

A restatement of the doctrine of the Holy Supper is required, if for no other reason, also for the sake of the multitudes who have abandoned the modernistic churches or ought to do so. With what group could they more consistently converge than with the mother church of Protestantism? For this reason the Lutherans of America cannot stand by the details of a formulary which permits a present-day theologian to declare that the offense of the Reformed, in rejecting the heavenly elements of the sacrament, is graver than that of the Roman Church, which rejects only [sic] the earthly elements through which the heavenly objects

are conveyed.[14] Great things are now being done in the Kingdom of God. The rediscovery of the Gospel, after experiencing the emptiness of modernism, by such scholars as Charles Clayton Morrison of the *Christian Century* and Reinhold Niebuhr, has been the severest blow dealt in the present generation to that perversion of Christianity. The movement in which they, providentially, are leaders invites support by the Church of the Reformation, which has never lost the Gospel from her confession and message. These men are right when they hold that "wooden dogma"—the attempt to convey truth through obsolete words and conceptions—requires abolition, and that the truth requires such formulation that those who confess it may live it not only spiritually but also contemporaneously. It will not hurt the Church of the Reformation to endorse the progressive sentiment of Paul Tillich when he writes: "Protestantism affirms divine sovereignty over the institutions and doctrines of the Christian church and protests against attempts to bind the Christian message to the life and law of any historic church."[15] The *Una Sancta* is vital fact; it should not be a grudging concession.

This leads us to a final consideration, that of the necessity for united action on the part of those who accept the old Gospel in sincerity and truth. To this end, a new confession is needed which shall not only embody the Gospel in a succinct and pointed manner but also be oriented to the present. That our Confessions will and should always receive veneration for the constructive part they have played in history, goes without saying, but their orientation to the past as well as their prolixity renders them unsuitable for the requirements of the present. The churches with Calvinistic antecedents do not represent at all points the Calvinism scourged in our Confessions, while the Romanism they scourge is today more self-reliant, potent, and compact as its serried ranks march into battle, than it was at the time of their scourging. New issues have arisen to which adjustment is demanded—evolution, the mutual relation of science and religion, the duty of the

14 *Lutheran Confessional Theology,* p. 63.
15 *The Protestant,* Vol. IV, p. 10.

church to the state, inspiration, to mention but a few salient ones—on which a more united and clear testimony needs to be uttered than is possible today on the basis of Confessions four centuries old.

With respect to dogma, the church of the future, if the deplorable separatism which has characterized the history of Protestantism is to be restricted, must exercise greater liberality. Insistence on the acceptance of peripheral doctrines as bond of fellowship, in the last analysis, means subjection to human authority. Even doctrines not peripheral in character are prone to assume in their elaboration a form so speculative as to obscure the essential truth intended to convey. A case in point is the subject of this treatise. There comes a point in the elaboration of doctrine in general where the philosophical element enshrouds the clearly Scriptural one; then and there it is time to apply the Pauline axiom: "Let every one be persuaded in his own mind."

The historian of present trends in the Church of the Reformation is likely to summarize them under the caption: LUTHERANS CONVERGE. To the superficial observer it will appear that this converging is taking place on the basis of a strict unanimous acceptance of all dogmas bearing the Confessional impress of 1580. They fool themselves. That "gulp" with which a group of eminent theologians of the left center accepted the definition laid down by their colleagues of the right center regarding inspiration is likely to become historic. There is no need to see eye to eye with respect to peripheral doctrines or the peripheral points of doctrines not peripheral. There *is* need to see eye to eye with respect to the spiritual implications involved in what is clearly revealed—indisputable Gospel, love, righteousness, forbearance, charity, *cooperative effort in spite of minor differences in relieving the woes of humanity*. So far, these words are not a delineation of fact. They are prophecy![16] When it comes to pass, things will be just right.

16 Vobis filiolis faustum det cernere mundum
Provida quem simulat pagina nostra Deus.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY: A SYMPOSIUM

THE OBLIGATION OF THE CHURCH

OSCAR FISHER BLACKWELDER
Washington, D. C.

THIS is a time and this is a theme for considered testimony, for the constructive pooling of all our insights upon the most difficult human problems of the hour. The chances are that no superman will construct the necessary formulas demanded by this time of destiny; these formulas may come out of a spiritual democracy in which average men contribute their God-given insights.

Since the early Christian era the church more or less has accepted its responsibility to engage in social relief or welfare work. However, when the church moves beyond or behind relief to tackle the causes that make relief work necessary, differences of opinion arise. It is in this debatable area of social action that we are thinking.

Let us understand at once what is not in debate. I find at least five clear points of agreement. (1) The basic mission of the church is so to introduce men to Christ as to develop in them dependable character. (2) It is the mission of the church to bind up the broken and heal the bruised, to engage in welfare and relief work. (3) It is the mission of the church to declare moral and spiritual principles which may serve as plumb lines for social thinking and action. (4) It is the mission of the church to inspire and instruct individual Christians to apply Christian principles as citizens in all their relationships. (5) It is the mission of the church to keep above the dust and dirt of selfish partisan politics but not remote from the human struggle.

But now let us come to grips with some matters which may be in debate.

The first is what I would call a confession of Christian faith in the field of social action. Or, seeing our faith in terms of human problems. This confession for me begins with a definition

of the sacred and the secular. I believe that nothing is secular except evil, that all of life is sacred except evil, that Jesus is God's word to man in every area of man's life since man cannot be an individualist but is a creature in relationships all the way from crib to grave.

So I believe that the Gospel is God speaking to and acting for man through Christ in the total of man's life and not simply in those moments of his aloneness. Then to claim the center of life, namely his own individual redemption, for Christ and leave the rest of his relationships to prudence, reason, government, or pagan environmental influences is tragedy. Then to speak of a spiritual or personal versus a social Gospel is missing the mark. Then the separation of our existence into internals and externals is a false division. Then Faith and Order are no more determinative or sacred than Life and Work. Indeed, God's grace seems to run a shuttle between the two. Then Christian worship is no more sacred than Christian work. In other words, the Christian way of life comes out of the unity of truth, and so the moral principles of Jesus do not apply alone to the regenerated; it is to be expected that they are able to live out these principles more fully than the unregenerate, but there is only one truth for all men. Thus history is constantly in judgment before Christ, for He is truth.

Therefore, the task of personal regeneration must be pursued with greater zeal than ever, but we dare not wait until every individual is personally converted to turn upon this broken world the light, the guidance, the insights of God's eternal truth. This means that the Christian church must address pertinent Christian truths to the tough social tasks of this present hour, for to be a Christian means to outlive, to outlove, to outthink the world and thus answer modern materialism with a greater philosophy of life. The purpose of this paper is to suggest some ways to do it.

First, it is the church's duty to write and print. This means to produce books, pamphlets, and magazine articles, but I am especially thinking here of religious journalism with its regular circulation. Few undertakings will make such journalism more

aggressive than to discuss and debate those issues of this hour which concern men's destinies, relating pertinent Christian truths to areas of tension and peril. Journalism must not only speak the word good and true for the ages, but the next best word it can grasp for this age. Religious journalism must be willing to go out on limbs and often perhaps feel the limbs being sawed off, with the resultant editorial tumble. But, changing the figure, no player ever carried a football who was not willing to be tackled and who knew how to fall. I have two specific illustrations of what I think religious journalism, both official and independent, should try to be. They are obviously different. One, the former *American Lutheran Survey,* edited by Walton Harlowe Greever, and the other, *The Christian Century,* by Charles Clayton Morrison. One thing characterized or characterizes both: their willingness to debate concrete human issues that concern the destinies of men and therefore the souls of men. This is the evangelical and democratic method of searching for or shedding light.

Second, it is the church's responsibility to study and discuss pertinent social issues, registering its findings to the general public, and particularly to appropriate government officials. This can be done in and through groups set up for that specific purpose, or in regular auxiliaries, and under necessary circumstances in the pulpit. Such service is imperative, for one reason, because of a change in the functions of government. Most of our traditional thinking in this field has been done on the basis of the government performing, largely, a police or restrictive function. Today the government is performing increasingly a total social function.

I should like to make myself crystal clear. As institutions, the government and the church in this country must be forever kept separate, but they are both concerned with society from different viewpoints. So all the data on certain public questions are not in until the church's study, thinking, and insights have been registered—relating pertinent Christian truths to areas of tension. This does not mean resolutions and petitions—they are too much like pickets carrying signs in front of the Capitol or White

House. It rather means informing, conveying to the proper governmental officials the fruit of the church's study. This means the difference between a study group and a pressure group. Of my personal knowledge competent officials welcome the registration of such study.

If the church has the right of protest when its own interests seem at stake, as when the United Lutheran Church protested against the appointment of an emissary to the Vatican and over the drafting of pre-theological students, how much more unselfish for the church to speak on issues in which her institutional life is not directly concerned! It is much more evangelical to secure justice for others than to get justice for oneself. How shall the church do this?

One of my friends insists that it was not Dr. Knubel or President Frederick Herman Knubel who protested the Vatican appointment with his personal presence at the White House; rather it was Citizen Knubel or Mr. Knubel. I am sure Dr. Knubel was received as the president of the United Lutheran Church in America and was addressed as President Knubel or Dr. Knubel by President Roosevelt. And why not? Ours is a representative form of government and society—representatives go to see the President. He cannot take in every individual. And, further, when the church approximates a representative voice our testimony becomes truly democratic. Not for a moment would I minimize the significance of the average individual acting as a citizen or in citizen groups. Nor would I minimize the significance of such outstanding individuals as Bishop Berggrav, for example. But remember the church he incarnates, heads, and represents. An *ecclesia* focuses in him. If it is morally heroic to represent the church in prison, why not out of prison in free America? The church is more than a collection of individuals, as a brick wall is more than a collection of bricks. It means a fellowship in action, an *ecclesia.* Thus corporate religious testimony may be the ultimate bulwark of our social liberty, as religious liberty undergirds every other liberty we hold dear.

Third, there are moments and occasions which demand con-

crete action in addition to the registration of the fruits of study. Such action must come only after most serious consideration and with a calmness, a poise, a dignity, a spirit, far removed from the professional reformer. The church is not an adjunct to the police force, nor is its power in legislative technique.

Only the rarest individual citizen can equal the constructive influence of a group of churchmen or of a well esteemed local pastor who bring to a public issue the moral strength of their churchmanship. They are not divested of that relationship but reinforced by it. I have watched this closely in many public hearings during the past dozen years. But let the churchman, both lay and clerical, be not so conscious of his church prestige as to be unprepared and unwilling to face rough and tumble cross-examination. Obviously, churchmen must possess some degree of skill before tackling this type of work.

Here are a few concrete illustrations of what I regard constructive action in this field. First I would name the protest over the Vatican appointment and concerning pre-theological students. And here are some further illustrations of specific action in necessary situations: A pastor so challenged the hard liquor interests in his immediate neighborhood as to win his point and the voluntary support of the governor of the state. A church led the defense of a large number of property owners against a city council plan for garbage collection for the entire city that would have meant a concentration of garbage trucks at a given point on their street every forty-eight seconds. A group of county pastors opposed the delegation in the state legislature which had sponsored a bill to establish a gigantic gambling institution in their county. Certain pastors and laymen appeared before a Congressional committee on juvenile delinquency. Numerous pastors over the nation, not content with personal letters, discussed the government's foreign policies before Pearl Harbor and sent copies of their speeches personally to President Roosevelt. Many of the Protestant clergy of the nation's capital protested in most understandable terms against the statements of the chairman of the Senate District Committee regarding race relations, which

statements were both un-American and un-Christian. One of the clergy's finest opportunities on social matters is not in public hearings but in presenting their positions before civic clubs, citizens' associations, and parent-teacher associations.

Augustine wrote *De Civitate Dei* when the city of man was falling. When the city of men was perishing the city of God was being charted. So the church must keep the splendor of God in the souls of men no matter how long our social dreams are frustrated or delayed. This means to challenge time in eternity. It means to try to be an earnest evangelist but also a constructive critic of contemporary society. It must never be said of men of God in these times that they failed to employ every available resource for tipping the scales of thought and action in the direction of right, as they see it. The church must tower o'er the wrecks of time and saturate the human spirit with divine glory.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH IN THE WORLD'S SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT

CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Rock Island, Illinois

NO ONE doubts the need of the world's social improvement. The church can agree with all the multitude of organizations and agencies which seek remedies for the ills of mankind. But there is something unique in the approach of the church to the problem.

In the first place, the church's definition of sin is unique. While all other attitudes see sin as maladjustment between man and man, or between man and his environment, the church holds that sin is a wrong relationship between man and God. This makes of sin a very personal matter—a matter in which each and every individual finds himself in the presence of the living God. Indeed, the basis of individuality is in this responsibility to God which cannot be divided or shared with any other. "It is against

Thee I have sinned, I have done evil in Thy sight" (Ps. 51:4, Moffatt's translation). This does not mean that sin may not be social in its implications and consequences. Man, who does not live or die unto himself alone, cannot sin in isolation. Sin corrupts both man and his environment. But wrong relationships with one's fellows is the obverse side of wrong relationship with God. Sin originates in unbelief, which is the nature of any condition where God is not central. In the doctrine of the church, sin is present wherever the life of man is separated from the fellowship of God and responsibility to Him.

Secondly, the church's definition of improvement is unique. It follows that if sin is a wrong relationship with God on the part of the individual, the remedy lies in a right orientation. God and man must be reconciled, or brought together. Man cannot effect such a reconciliation. God has effected it in and through Jesus Christ. He has paid the price. He is now able to forgive sin and to unite man in the fellowship of God. This is the church's doctrine of salvation, which remains central in any consideration of the social improvement of mankind. Others may propose a variety of means to remove man's maladjustment, either with nature or fellowmen. But all remedies which by-pass the central issue of man's relationship to his God are but palliatives which may conceal the essential malignity but only at the peril of spreading it. Improvement of living conditions, discovery of new secrets of nature, systems of laws—all have certain value, but none or all of them can cure the disease. The pig-sty may be cleansed, and better food and working terms may be secured, but life is still prodigal until the individual returns to the Father's house. It is there that economics and sociology must take their start.

These unique features of the Christian approach to social reform give us the basis on which to reply to the criticisms which are aimed at the teaching of the church. We admit that there is validity in the criticism, but we hold that the fault is with Christians who have failed to sense the full truth of the Gospel. For instance, it is charged that Christian thought is too individualistic.

The individual is concerned only with the salvation of his personal soul, and is not interested in the problems of society. There is truth in this criticism, but the fault is in the error of Christians who have appropriated the Gospel to themselves as a means of comfort only, when in reality it is intended to be a source of power for help to fellowmen. The Gospel is written in universal terms, "God loved *the world*." It is not the will of God that *any man* shall be lost. The Incarnation implies a promise to *all men*. Christians have wanted to dam up the water of life for their own purposes instead of being channels through which the streams of the spirit's influence might reach all the world. There is no basis in Scripture for Christians' reluctance to tackle the moral and social enemies of mankind. Not Christian faith, but lack of faith, has led to the trimming of the Gospel to suit the comforts and conveniences of Christians. The parable of the Good Samaritan indicates the horizons of Christian philanthropy, and the words of the Apostle John are crucial for all Christian sociology, "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen" (I John 4:20). If Christian thought on social problems is restricted and individualistic, it is not because the Gospel so treats them.

A second criticism charges the church's social contribution as being merely a creed, or dogma. Again the validity of the charge lies in the tendency of Christians to allow their religion to be a theory, rather than a power. And Christians have been slow to relate that power to every phase of life. They have been satisfied with measures which will perpetuate a church organization, instead of viewing the church as a light for all mankind and a leaven for all society. But this is not the fault of the Christian Gospel, which is a power of God unto the salvation of all peoples. If Christians allow the Spirit of God to work the fruits of faith in their lives, we would find Christians active in politics, in business, in the professions. We would find them engaged in all the arts and sciences, in national movements and international organizations. A wrong interpretation of "the world" has cut the Christian off from the activities of mankind in a world created

by God, and given him a monastic view of society which is not in accord with a world-redeeming Gospel. Not only souls, but areas of life in which souls dwell, are to be redeemed, and redeemed by Christians who are created unto good works by the Creator who made the world and recreated them. Christians have allowed much of God's world to go to the devil and his followers by default—they have failed to claim their Father's property for the children of the Kingdom. Some have even wanted to surrender the mind and reason to the powers of darkness, ignoring the doctrine of the image of God in man.

The church is not hostile to society, nor unconcerned about the will of God being done on earth, as it is done in heaven. But a final word may be in place as to the factor of a "planned society." As citizens, Christians will give their best thought to a reordering of life in accordance with God's will for state and society. But they will have no delusions about the efficacy of blueprinting the future. They will remember that society will be effectively changed only as each Christian individual becomes a creative cell in the organism of society. What would happen if all men came into right relationship with God and lived out the implications of child-like obedience to Him is, at this stage, simply inconceivable. We do not even know what we should plan for such a society. Yet we shall go on bringing Christ into every possible place and heart, so that each new recruit may join the household which would transform the order of the world into the glorious fellowship of the people of God.

MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHURCH IN SOCIAL ACTION

WALTON H. GREEVER
New York City

1. *To produce a church membership that is fit and effective for Christian membership in society.* This means nothing less than genuine and thorough conversion to the Christian religion,

through regeneration to a transformed life. This is the plainly revealed will of God, as the supreme mission of the church. This means unreserved acceptance of revealed truth in its totality, and unconditional committal to the will of God for the whole of life.

With specific reference to the church in a mixed society, it is the definite responsibility of the church to awaken and promote a sound and sincere social consciousness in its membership, with constant insistence that Christians must consistently practice the Christian religion, every day in every way, in all relationships, without compromise, regardless of cost.

To repeat, the first and chief responsibility of the church in relation to social *action* is to produce thoroughly Christianized *actors*. A real Christian is a force. A nominal Christian is a farce. On this point the non-Christian is not a fool; he knows the difference. Mere professions, no matter how good, which are not sustained by a consistent life, are futile.

2. *To increase that membership.* This is distinctly the mission of the church in its work of evangelism. As the former responsibility is to do *intensive* work with the membership already enrolled, so this is *extensive* work for the Christianizing of non-Christians. As this extensive work succeeds, the Christian forces in society are augmented, and the pagan forces are reduced. This is where the leaven of the Christian religion works most effectively for the transformation of society. It is here that permanent and genuine betterment is secured.

3. *To interpret to its members the true meaning of life, in terms of values.* There are temporal values and there are eternal values, material and spiritual—with relative worth. It is only when the pursuit of values is motivated by devotion to eternal worth that love is free to practice an unselfish stewardship, as the solvent of many economic and social problems. He who cares alone for temporal values must of necessity be selfish, no matter how refined his selfishness, because he has no true appreciation of personality, per se.

The eternal values are spiritual, potentially inherent in personality, and can be neither possessed selfishly nor exploited for

selfish ends. The temporal values are merely means to the end, the acquisition and enjoyment of spiritual values. The pursuit of spiritual values involves concern for the eternal welfare of all men, because those values center in God and preclude the prejudices, injustices, and competitions which characterize the pursuit of temporal values for themselves.

Since all eternal values center in God, they can be neither pursued nor acquired by the self-centered man. He who lives his life according to the true meaning of life will be an unselfish servant to all of his fellowmen.

4. *To combat evil in every form.* Here again the primary responsibility of the church is for the lives of its own members. And here, as to the non-Christian world, its primary responsibility is to proclaim God's condemnation upon *sin* before any attempt to deal with specific *sins*. Even willful evildoers are cowardly in the presence of godliness. Only hatred for sin makes victory over evil possible. It takes light to dispel darkness. Health is the power to resist germs.

The church condemns itself whenever it goes beyond the spirit, purpose, and form of God's condemnation of evil. God never condemns any specific evil in any way that seems to give tolerance to any other evil, and every condemnation of every evil refers directly to the heart-source of all evil. Many in the church have a crusading zeal for certain social proprieties, who have no corresponding loyalty to humble holiness.

5. *To educate its members with reference to the principles and practices of Christian citizenship.* It is in the sphere of citizenship that organized social action is most assertive. It is here that pronouncements are most prolific, with full use of the pressure group system, and there is always a temptation for church groups to employ the same means for ends which they believe to be good. Christian citizens have rights in these respects, and responsibilities, too, in obedience to conscience. It is the responsibility of the church to give them that fundamental instruction necessary for intelligence of conscience, and the will to obey conscience through the orderly channels provided by govern-

ment. The church, as such, does not become either a sub- or a super-government, and should never allow its members to become confused in their loyalties to church and state. It is the responsibility of the church to produce Christian citizens who will exercise all of their rights in the enactment and enforcement of laws, and will support the government in conscientious loyalty, while they work, in an orderly way, for its betterment.

6. *To encourage and direct community service.* The greatest volume, and the finest quality, and the most fruitful effort of social service is that given by individuals, through a personal ministry, to the people next to them. One is almost justified in asking if such service is not the only medium through which the passionate preachments, the profound pronouncements, and promotional programs of the professional directors of "social action" are really transmitted to the life of society. No matter how that question may be answered, this personal ministry in the community is the real thing in social action, and the responsibility for it is an immediate responsibility of the church with direct personal contacts in every community where the church exists. In this connection the church has specific responsibilities: (a) to root the service in sound Christian ethics; (b) to motivate it in the name and spirit of Christ; (c) to give such technical instruction as is possible; (d) and to implement and direct service wherever systematic operation is possible.

7. To extend community service as a missionary enterprise. This is especially necessary in areas of large population, where community lines and life are not distinct and parish service is inadequate. In such areas, with various population elements and varied living conditions, there is need for specialized services, and there are always possibilities that great groups of people may be neglected. Class and race problems, vice centers, and anti-Christian forces are likely to be prevalent in such areas.

For this service the church needs to organize and maintain societies through which specialization and co-operation are secured. For this service it is the responsibility of the church to provide trained workers who understand the problems involved,

who know what procedures are proper and efficient, and who can secure the necessary interest from the supporting constituents.

8. *To provide for the care of dependents.* This service requires the maintenance and operation of institutions, such as orphanages, hospitals, homes for aged and incurables, etc. Such institutions give care, security, and comfort not only to those who live in them, but also to hosts of relatives and friends who alone cannot give the service required. And this service is given, unhampered, in the name and spirit of Christ, as an expression of that love for Him which is always accompanied by love for His suffering disciples. Furthermore, these institutions become missionary in their service to those who support them, in the examples they furnish of Christian faith and patience, and as an appealing outlet for benevolent impulses.

As far as possible, it is the responsibility of the church also to furnish similar spiritual ministry to those whose physical needs are provided for in state institutions. For all of its institutional service it is the responsibility of the church to provide trained workers.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE WORLD OF NATIONS

O. FREDERICK NOLDE
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BY THE preaching of the Gospel, the Christian church seeks to bring men into right relations with God through repentance and faith in Christ. This is the first and the primary task of the church. Rightly understood, it is all-inclusive in its scope. It touches life at every point—the life of man with God, man's personal conduct, man's relations as an individual to the lives of other men, the contacts which are maintained when men organize themselves into social or national groups. The truth of Christianity is relevant to every human need. When Christian leaders address their message only to the cultivation of faith and ignore the implications of faith for life, they may be despairing of God's power

for good in human experience; they may be counting upon man to express his faith even when he has not been trained to do so or when conditions favorable to its expression are not at hand; they certainly will be making the highly complicated process of Christian living in modern society a matter of chance.

The Christian church, through its leadership, has a clear responsibility to develop in people not only a faith which will relate them adequately to God, but also a faith which will make them a force for righteousness throughout the world. This will require that faith take on a dynamic quality, a fervor more deeply rooted in eternal truth and more discerning of human needs than modern faiths of Communism, Fascism, Naziism, or Co-Prosperity. To this end Christian leaders in our own and other countries have been directing their efforts in recent years. The resulting developments have been so rapid and interrelated that a movement seems to be crystalizing. It is frequently referred to as the Christian Movement Toward World Order. It is presently marked by five significant characteristics. (1) The Christian Movement Toward World Order views war as a symptom or manifestation of an international disease and seeks to bring pertinent Christian truths to bear upon the root causes or tension points from which international maladjustments or wars inevitably emerge. (2) It is transcending the lines of separation fixed by traditional faiths, and, in areas of common agreement, is enlisting the co-operation of men of good will everywhere. (3) It is cultivating an international Christian approach to international problems. (4) It is proceeding with an attack from the top down; that is, it is attempting to establish and to maintain effective contacts with governmental leaders. (5) It is proceeding with an attack from the bottom up; that is, it is attempting to enlighten and strengthen the consciences of Christians in all walks of life, so that they will assume a responsible part as Christian citizens.

A righteous and dynamic faith is the fundamental requisite if we, as Christians, seek to cope with the problems which the world of nations sets before us. Faith, however, cannot express itself in a vacuum, nor can it operate merely as a generalization.

It needs to be pointed in articulate fashion to the circumstances by which men are met. This requires the formulation of principles and programs by which life among the peoples of the world may be ordered. To be sure, orderly and constructive world relations cannot be achieved merely by drafting policies. Formulations can only reveal the channels along which faith may move in its activities and the goals toward which it ought to strive. Three major steps to guide Christian effort in the direction of world order are here suggested. They are identified as an aid to clear thinking on international issues; for in face of multitudinous addresses, pamphlets, and proposals, considerable confusion is abroad. Each is viewed from the standpoint of Christian responsibility. Each is illustrated by what seem to be the most significant documents to have appeared from Christian sources in our country.

The *first step* has to do with moral and spiritual foundations upon which world order must be based. These have been set forth in a *Statement of Guiding Principles.* This statement was adopted by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace and was approved by the Federal Council of Churches in December, 1942. Within the preamble and the twelve theses of the statement are contained convictions which Christians can endorse with a measure of finality. A few quotations must suffice to indicate the nature of this document.

> As members of the Christian Church, we seek to view all problems of world order in the light of the truth concerning God, man, and God's purpose for the world made known in Jesus Christ. We believe that the eternal God revealed in Christ is the Ruler of men and of nations and that His purpose in history will be realized. For us He is the source of moral law and the power to make it effective.
>
> From this faith Christians derive the ethical principles upon which world order must be based. . . . (From the Preamble.)
>
> We believe that moral law, no less than physical law, undergirds our world. There is a moral order which is fundamental and eternal, and which is relevant to the corporate life of men and the ordering of human society. If mankind is to escape chaos and recurrent war, social and political institutions must be brought into conformity with this moral order. (Principle 1.)

We believe that the sickness and suffering which afflict our present society are proof of indifference to, as well as direct violation of, the moral law. All share in responsibility for the present evils. . . . (From Principle 2.)

We believe that it is contrary to the moral order that nations in their dealings with one another should be motivated by a spirit of revenge and retaliation. (From Principle 3.)

We believe that a supreme responsibility rests upon the Church. The Church, being a creation of God in Jesus Christ, is called to proclaim to all men everywhere the way of life. Moreover, the Church which is now in reality a world community, may be used of God to develop His spirit of righteousness and love in every race and nation and thus to make possible a just and durable peace. For this service Christians must now dedicate themselves, seeking forgiveness for their sins and the constant guidance and help of God, upheld by the faith that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of Christ and that He shall reign forever and ever. (Principle 12.)

With few exceptions, the *Guiding Principles* are "timeless;" that is, their inherent truth could find application in various periods of human history. (The same is largely true of a similar form, the "Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant Declaration on World Peace," released in October, 1943, over the signatures of 144 religious leaders in the United States.) This "timeless" character makes it necessary to frame proposals which apply more directly to the present world situation.

The *second step* attempts to relate the general moral and spiritual foundations to the conditions and needs of our own day. No effort is here made to work out detailed programs. The essential purpose is to couch the principles in terms of such propositions as will come to grips with current needs. The *Statement of Political Propositions* is an illustration in point. Popularly known as the *Six Pillars of Peace,* the Statement was adopted by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace. It was accepted by the International Round Table at Princeton in July, 1943, as indicative of what people in all countries should study, understand, and personally accept and seek to have accepted by their governments. Further, it was given substantial endorsement by fourteen Christian leaders in England, including the archbishop of

Canterbury, the archbishop of York, and the moderator of the Church of Scotland. It has found its way into many different lands. For example, it is currently being used for study purposes in China, Australia, and New Zealand. The six propositions are here given without their accompanying comments.

1. The peace must provide the political framework for continuing collaboration of the United Nations and, in due course, of neutral and enemy nations.
2. The peace must make provision for bringing within the scope of international agreement those economic and financial acts of national governments which have widespread international repercussions.
3. The peace must make provision for an organization to adapt the treaty structure of the world to changing underlying conditions.
4. The peace must proclaim the goal of autonomy for subject peoples, and it must establish international organization to assure and to supervise the realization of that end.
5. The peace must establish procedures for controlling military establishments everywhere.
6. The peace must establish in principle, and seek to achieve in practice, the right of individuals everywhere to religious and intellectual liberty.

In concise fashion and with an intentional limitation to certain immediately crucial issues, the Six Pillars attempt to fix the direction which our nation and other nations must follow in order that the primary moral and spiritual principles may find fuller expression. The Political Propositions, taken alone, are not a distinctively Christian document. Rather, they embrace certain broad political conclusions which seem to flow from the fundamental Christian principles. They are that product of Christian insight which resulted when men of Christian conviction sought to bring the impact of faith to bear upon the realities of international political relationship. To the extent that these propositions involve judgments on technical matters and questions of human behavior, they are subject to human fallibility and must be distinguished from the primary principles which carry the authority of the Gospel. By virtue of its relation to the first and third steps, the second moves in the area of "middle axioms."

The *third step* is concerned with the plans and programs by which governments are actually to be related to each other. It may be thought of as the "blue-printing" procedure, whether in its more preliminary or its more final stages. In the construction of specific programs or blueprints, the Christian church, as a church, has no immediate part. Obviously, individual Christian citizens who have particular political or economic competence ought to be encouraged to assume positions of leadership and to make their voices heard.

While the Christian church has no organic part in working out political and economic programs, nevertheless, through its leadership, it has a clear responsibility to meet. The moral principles and the political propositions which its leaders have formulated must be made to serve a twofold purpose in relation to governmental proposals. In the first place, they must serve to direct those who are empowered to make specific plans. They are the means whereby the benefit of Christian insights and judgments is placed at the disposal of leaders in government. In this manner the Guiding Principles, the Interfaith Statement, and the Political Propositions have already been used. For example, they have played an important part in the repeal of the Oriental Exclusion Act as far as China is concerned; they were instrumental in the passage of the Fullbright and Connally resolutions.

In the second place, the moral foundations and the political propositions provide the standards for appraising specific plans when they have been made. Procedures of valuation are as yet in their experimental stage. Two appraisals have been attempted. The Moscow Declaration was measured against the standards set by Christian leaders and was found to be encouraging in those areas of international problems with which it was concerned. In concluding his valuation, John Foster Dulles stated:

> We can properly characterize the Moscow Declarations as being a notable step toward realizing international order as envisaged by our Six Pillars of Peace. They mark a great development from the Atlantic Charter, which proposed no international institutions and which contained no reference to religious and intellectual freedom. There still remain major

omissions to which we have referred, notably the omission to deal with colonial or economic matters. There are ambiguities, as in such a phrase as 'peace-loving nations.' But the positive aspects of the Moscow Declarations are sound, rejecting as they do any attempt to base world order merely on the military alliance of a few. The Declarations do recognize a special interim responsibility on Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., China and the U.S. for 'joint action on behalf of the community of nations.' But, as said in our *Long-Range Peace Objectives* (September 18, 1941) 'the end of the present war will find an overwhelming concentration of power in one or two nations. That power will be a reality the implications of which we cannot avoid. Our task will be to make it a beneficent reality. That requires that we use our power, not to perpetuate itself, but to create, support and eventually give way to international institutions drawing their vitality from the whole family of nations.' That appears to be the spirit and objective of the Moscow Decisions.

The Christian forces of this country can be grateful that their government has cooperated with the governments of Great Britain, Russia and China to make a sound beginning for world order. We can legitimately feel that we have done much to create here a public opinion that has made this possible. We must not, however, be complacent or relax our efforts. The Moscow Declarations go only part of the way. Even then they are still words. To move from words into functioning institutions infused with the spirit of Christian fellowship remains a political and spiritual task of immense proportions.

In analyzing the Cairo Communique, Kenneth Latourette found much to be desired. He acknowledged that one positive and admirable feature was the full recognition of China in the councils of the United Nations through participation on equal terms in the Cairo conference. He also recognized as just the demands that Japan return territories to China which had been taken by acts of aggression, and release the mandated islands which she had used as bases for military operations. He goes on to say:

Viewed, however, from the standpoint of a just and durable peace in the Far East, the communique is extremely disappointing. The third Guiding Principle approved by our Commission states that it is 'contrary to the moral order that nations in their dealings with one another should be motivated by a spirit of revenge and retaliation. Such attitudes will lead,

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

as they always have led, to renewed conflict.' The disposition of territory proposed in the communique will require so drastic an adjustment in the economy of Japan as to threaten the livelihood of her people. Without some assurance that the powers are prepared to grant the Japanese people opportunity to make possible a legitimate livelihood, the implication is that a complete and permanent crippling of the Japanese nation is contemplated. We believe this attitude violates the basic moral principles of a just and durable peace. In failing to take cognizance of the economic situation in which Japan will be left by this reduction in her empire, the Cairo communique falls short of the position of the Atlantic Charter which assures all states, 'victors as well as vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity. . . .'

The communique is confined to stating the purposes of the three Allies toward Japan. Presumably because of this limited purpose it does not deal with such matters as (a) the possible restoration to China of Hongkong, (b) the possible independence, even though at a remote date, of the territories in the East Indies and Southeast Asia which have been occupied by the Japanese, (c) the future disposition of the Pacific Islands which are to be 'stripped' from Japan.

Due to such omissions the communique falls far short of stating the basic prerequisites for a just and durable peace in the Far East. . . .

It is ardently to be desired that the three governments responsible for the communique will take early steps to speak about these matters and to allay fears which will increasingly be aroused if silence is prolonged.

The moral foundations and the political propositions derived therefrom must continue to serve these two purposes. They must be used to direct leaders of government who are in the process of formulating specific plans. They must provide standards for appraising the specific plans which have been formulated. Herein may be the kernel of a new strategy through which Christian teaching can be brought to bear more effectively upon international problems.

The nations of the world are now moving rapidly into the third of the above areas, the area of specific planning. Innumerable obstacles to a just peace are to be expected. In face of mounting perplexities and anticipated difficulties, what attitude shall we as Christians hold? A recent pronouncement by the

Commission on a Just and Durable Peace concludes with these words:

Therefore, as of instant importance in the year before us,

We urge our public leaders to take steps to endow the projected world organization with responsibilities that are curative and creative and not merely repressive. That is the only type of world organization which, in our judgment, the Christian forces of our nation will solidly support.

We urge our people to remain united and vigorous to achieve such international organization and American participation therein. If there are disappointments as to particular settlements, that is a reason, not for relapse toward political aloofness, but for even stronger efforts to achieve world organization which has potentialities for correcting mistakes and developing a true fellowship of people.

In conclusion, we appeal to the people in our churches to stand strong in their faith in God. Our hope rests upon the knowledge that He rules in the affairs of men and nations. Plans arising from the despair born of fear or from the frenzy born of passion are destined to failure. Let us proclaim boldly and clearly, 'The Lord thy God reigneth.' As the power of our nation is used in conformity with His laws it will contribute to the establishing of a just and durable peace.

HENRY EYSTER JACOBS (1844-1932) IN RETROSPECT

BENJAMIN LOTZ
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

THIS would seem to be an appropriate time to make an appraisal of Henry Eyster Jacobs—appropriate not only because it is the hundredth anniversary of his birth but also because any appraisal of his life will bring an appraisal of his work, particularly his work as a systematic theologian. And a study of his theological work, of his achievements and endeavors, ought to be valuable for the theologians of the United Lutheran Church in America today, when they are called upon to do for their age and generation what Dr. Jacobs did for his.

Unfortunately the theologians and historians of the Lutheran Church —though more than a decade of years has elapsed since his death—have not given the fair and adequate appraisal that he deserves. It is true that both *The Lutheran* and *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* published accounts of his life and tributes concerning his work and worth at the time of his death, but any criticism of a great man at that time is likely to be colored by the sense of loss and a proper perspective is bound to be wanting.[1]

The historians of the church ought to tell the story as an important chapter in the history of the Lutheran Church in America. It would be a kind of trilogy—Michael, the grandfather; then Henry, the father; and finally Charles, the son. In the best sense of the word, it would be life and theology with father, for Henry Eyster Jacobs was in many ways the Father of Lutheran Theology in America. This has never been done and there seem to be little prospects that it will ever be done adequately. Biographies of American Lutherans are not best sellers. The managers of our publishing houses know that!

There is a kind of irony in the fact that the life of Henry Eyster Jacobs has never been written. As early as the first decade of the present century, sensing that the experiences of his life would have meaning for subsequent generations of Lutherans, Henry Eyster Jacobs wrote his memoirs. Out of respect for certain living persons, it was deemed advisable after his death not to make them available for some time to those generally interested in the Lutheran Church in America. It is reported, however,

1 *The Lutheran*, July 21, 1932, and *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, January, 1933. The latter contains panegyrical tributes—the adjective is used in its etymological sense—by Drs. H. Offermann, Abdel Ross Wentz, J. A. W. Haas, and F. H. Knubel. At such times the Latin proverb ought still to read: *de mortuo nihil nisi verum*, not *bonum*.

that in 1942 an annotated copy was deposited in Philadelphia. On the basis of this report, it could well be assumed that the family of Dr. Jacobs was willing to make these memoirs accessible to persons desiring to use them for legitimate, historical purposes. Unfortunately, at the present time, they are not accessible in the Krauth Memorial Library in Philadelphia.[2]

Henry Eyster Jacobs was almost seventy-nine years old when I first met him. Born in Gettysburg, November 10, 1844, he shared the honors of the day with Martin Luther and Friedrich Nietzsche. At seventy-nine,. at eighty, and at eighty-one years, he was still vigorous. When about seventy-five years of age, he was made the first president of the Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia. When I first met him, there was still a glow of fire in his eyes, salt in his speech, and a kind of humor that was apt and to the point. Back of him lay a distinguished career as historian, dogmatician, liturgiologist, teacher, scholar, and, in the best sense of the word, prince of the church.

The work of telling his story and appraising his worth would be a fascinating one for a capable, trained historian. Some facts of the outward course of his career must be told here. They are not ready at hand for most persons, and yet they are rather necessary for anyone who would be interested in his theology. He first knew the world in the little village of Gettysburg in the *ante bellum* days. There was located Pennsylvania College and the Lutheran Seminary on Seminary Ridge, the dominant spirit of which was Samuel Schmucker.[3] At Pennsylvania College taught Michael Jacobs from 1829 to 1866. He had studied theology privately. His interest was chiefly centered in the natural sciences, though the theological discussion of his day was not alien to him. The delineation of his picture would find its counterpart in that of many other clergymen teaching in similar denominational colleges of that period.

As might be expected, Henry Eyster Jacobs studied at Pennsylvania College, where he became a tutor, and also at Gettysburg Seminary. It would be interesting and helpful if in this place we had his own recollections of the kind of theological instruction he received during his seminary days.

2 It is a temptation not easily to be withstood to place here lines taken from Browning's "One Word More." They at least half apply to the Memoirs.

> "Guido Reni dying, all Bologna
> Cried, and the world cried too, 'Ours—
> The treasure!'
> Suddenly, as rare things will, it vanished."

3 In 1927, more than fifty years after his death, Vergilius Ferm published *A Crisis in American Lutheran Theology*. This was an estimate of the work of Samuel Schmucker, but the Lutheran Church had to wait a long time for this belated tribute to a bold warrior.

In his *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States,* he describes theological education of a period, apparently, previous to his own student days. It is quite possible that his description is colored and influenced by his own experience and is more autobiographical than at first we might suspect.

> The Seminary Course was very brief, and the teaching scarcely rose above, if it equalled the standards of better catechetical instruction. There was even a tendency to depreciate sacred learning, as relatively unimportant, and to throw all stress upon devotional exercises. The teaching became hortatory instead of doctrinal, and no longer covered the full extent of revelation.[4]

After a brief pastoral experience and a principalship at Thiel Hall, Henry Eyster Jacobs began in 1870 to teach at Pennsylvania College. He remained in that position until he was called to the Philadelphia Seminary in 1883. Then he became the second incumbent of the Norton Professorship of Systematic Theology and the successor of Charles Porterfield Krauth.

If there were no other reasons, American Lutherans ought to be grateful to Henry Eyster Jacobs for his historical and liturgiological endeavors.[5] Apart from numerous articles published in theological journals, he was co-editor of the *Lutheran Cyclopedia,* an editor of the *Documentary History of the Pennsylvania Ministerium,* and author of a life of Martin Luther and also of a volume, to which reference has previously been made, in the American Church History Series (1893). This was published in 1893.

This history of the Lutheran Church deserves considerable attention. It begins with an extensive, seven-page bibliography listing works in English, Latin, German, Dutch, and Swedish, though there is not always conclusive evidence that the author has used all of these works in the text of his history.[6] The bibliography is followed by an essay on the nature of Lutheranism. The statement has hardly been surpassed in any writing of similar scope and compass. Today, after a lapse of fifty years, these pages, simplified a bit, would be an admirable basis for a tract concerning the message and mission of the Lutheran Church. In such statements Dr. Jacobs is seen at his best.[7]

4 P. 370.

5 The quantity of material produced by Dr. Jacobs was enormous. In comparison with his contemporaries, and with the theologians of this decade, he was the John Gerhard of American Lutheranism. The Philadelphia Seminary Record credits him, in 1923, with having contributed to *The Lutheran Church Review,* among other periodicals, 71 articles, and to the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* 137 articles. Compare also the bibliography of his works in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* for April, 1933.

6 Dr. Wentz, in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* for 1933, declares that Dr. Jacobs also knew French. I have never found any indication that he knew the language or prized anything of which the French language was the medium of expression.

7 Compare also the brief foreword to *Oremus* (1925), written when he was probably in his eightieth year.

Of course, this is by no means the only historical work that Dr. Jacobs ever did and by no means the most brilliant or original. But it is a good work by which to view him as one of the greatest historical scholars that the Lutheran Church in America has ever produced. It is true that he was not a *trained* historical scholar in any modern sense of the word. He certainly knew little of historiography, and it is doubtful whether he was *conscious* of good historical method. He was loyal to the truth and consecrated to it. He possessed, to a high degree, a kind of historical instinct which made him list historical sources even if he did not find it convenient to use them as carefully as he might have done.[8]

Dr. Jacobs had a tendency to be diffusive in his writings, and often, when he indulges in otherwise pardonable digressions, it seems to be particularly the case. An instance of this is his treatment of the contacts between Wesley and the early Lutherans. This, however, must be a minor criticism of his work. Generally there is an excellent objectivity to his historical writings. Knowing his development, his early and constant devotion to the Lutheran Confessions and his great antipathy to non-Confessional Lutheranism, he tells the story of the New Measures and the Definite Platform with great impartiality, especially when we consider that he had lived through the bitter controversy that led to the rupture of the General Synod.

Perhaps Dr. Jacobs was too near the Predestination Controversy of the last century to appreciate its significance. He dismisses it in his history of the Lutheran Church with a few pages. He seems, too, actually to have been unacquainted with the significant literature that it produced. The sources for his judgment are not listed, save a long quotation from Charles Porterfield Krauth. Yet it must be said that this volume tells the story of early American Lutheranism in a manner that will stimulate the diligent student today to further study and investigation.[9]

8 Even if this is a popular work, written in the midst of multifarious duties, he leans heavily on secondary sources. It is doubtful whether the first part of the book could have been written so easily if it had not been for the existence of Gräbner's *Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika!*

9 I am conscious that many will not fully share my judgment of Dr. Jacobs as a historian. Dr. Wentz said of him, in his memorial address, printed in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* in 1933 (pp. 15-23): As a youth his soul was made to glow "with devotion to liberty and democracy, those two corollaries of evangelical Lutheran faith." As a man we find a "well balanced judgment in portraying events and estimating processes in the history of the church." Then his personal attainments are enumerated in this wise—"his native talents and his studious habits, his abounding opportunities for study and observation, his mastery of languages perfected by teaching these subjects, . . . authoritative and reliable, . . . his prodigious memory, . . . marvelous accuracy, . . . his intense desire for the truth, . . . his absolute honesty with himself, his downright historical veracity, . . . his mastery of languages, his scrupulous fidelity to the truth, his temperamental impartiality, his versatility of scholarship, his great per-

At about the same time Dr. Jacobs collected a series of articles that had appeared in the ecclesiastical press and published them under the title of *The Lutheran Movement in England*.[10] These were largely liturgiological studies to show the English-speaking world the effect that the Lutheran Reformation had had in England. There is a discussion of the Ten Articles of 1536, the Bishops' Book, the English Bibles, the Book of Common Prayer, and the English Litany. There must have been many purposes present in the mind of the author that prompted him to carry to completion this painstaking work. Prominent was the historian's delight in throwing light on matters otherwise obscure and neglected. There was, no doubt, a pride born of a growing Lutheran consciousness that desired to show the unwilling if not unwitting Church of England to what degree it was indebted to the Lutheran Reformation of the sixteenth century. In any case, the book shows the vast learning of Henry Eyster Jacobs in matters pertaining to liturgiology and no Lutheran pastor of today ought to be unacquainted with this great work. It has not been surpassed.

The present appraisal aims to lay greatest emphasis on the work of Dr. Jacobs as a systematic theologian, and to that we now turn in some detail. In 1868, at twenty-four years of age, in collaboration with G. F. Spieker, he had translated Hutter's *Compend of Lutheran Theology,* and in 1876, with C. A. Hay, he translated Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology of the Lutheran Church.* This was followed in 1882 with a translation of *The Book of Concord with an Historical Introduction.*

It is extremely difficult for us in 1944 to realize fully what these works must have meant to students and earnest young pastors in the days of theological controversy, especially to those who were unable to read, with any fluency, Lutheran theology written in Latin and German. Dr. Jacobs was one of the first to make Lutherans speak theological English. For these were the years when Lutheranism had just begun to express itself in English. Krauth's epoch-making work on *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* (1872) was just ten years old.

In 1884 Dr. Jacobs' inaugural address, incident to the beginning of his work as professor at Philadelphia, was published. At this point we may mark the beginning of his real development. A look at it convinces us that this young man had already begun to think through the theological problems of his day. From his work as translator and writer, he knew the old Lutheran theology and knew it well. The inaugural address, however, also

severance and unflagging industry, . . . revealed no pet aversions, no blind devotion to pre-conceived ideas, no outspoken prejudices. His work was creative, not borrowed. . . . The historian of the far-off future will survey the history of the Lutherans in America and the writing of history among them. We can easily imagine him distinguishing two main periods, the pre-Jacobs and the post-Jacobs period."

10 1890. Reprinted in 1916.

shows a progressive, and, one might add, a forward-looking, realization of the work before him. He already saw the duty of the church in regard to the cultivation of the theological sciences, and its task of communicating its faith to the religious world of America in the English language, and in the "molds of thought of the nineteenth century," as he expressed it a few years later.[11] In this address he pointed out that, in the construction of a system of theology, the inner relationship between the various Christian doctrines must be manifested by their relationship to the central doctrine of Christian life and preaching.

> In other words, the doctrine of justification by faith alone without works should be made the focal point whither all rays are to tend, and whence again they are to diverge. Without losing sight of a single doctrine the Holy Ghost reveals, we would give this an especial prominence, with the full use of all the rich material our Confessions and all other writings of the Reformation period have bequeathed. . . . In other words, the most convenient centre for our treatment of theology is the centre of that experience of divine things which the Holy Ghost has wrought with through his word—the centre of our own personal fellowship with God. Such we believe would be the centre which St. Paul would adopt, were he raised from the dead and placed in the professor's chair.[12]

If we did not know the subsequent development of Dr. Jacobs' theology, we might have hoped for greater things than he achieved. Here is one who has known not only the Confessions and the great Lutheran Fathers—his work as translator gives ample evidence of that—but he knows the great central message of the Reformation. He appreciates the centrality of the great doctrine of justification by faith, that *articulus sive stantis sive cadentis ecclesiae*. He, too (we could have speculated had we been in Philadelphia on that day), has gotten inspiration from the revival of Confessional Lutheranism at Erlangen, and he wants to introduce to America a just and sane appreciation of experience in the formulation of the Christian faith.

Anyone who reasoned that way was bound for disappointment. For in 1894, after more than ten years at the seminary, the mature Dr. Jacobs published the *Elements of Religion*. The author declares that this work is "his own personal testimony on topics, the significance and life of which, he has often apprehended, are obscured by the close methods of analysis and demands of rigid, logical precision necessarily required in their more scientific treatment."[13] The methodology adopted in this book is the old *loci communes* or topical method of theology. The plan and the proposal made ten years before in the inaugural address have apparently been put aside. There is no real discussion concerning the canon of the Scriptures.

11 *The History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, etc., p. 523.
12 *Lutheran Church Review*, 1884, pp. 13-14.
13 *Elements of Religion*, p. 3.

Was that never a problem for the Lutheran Church in the nineteenth century? Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth seemingly was never troubled by it, nor was his successor, Henry Eyster Jacobs.

For the Scriptures—of course, the canonical Scriptures—must be accepted by faith. Dr. Jacobs never thought through this question, though he expended seven pages in the discussion.[14] He does not deny that the center of revelation is Christ, but he never makes it clear that our acceptance of the truth of the Scriptures is absolutely dependent upon our trust in Christ as Lord and Saviour. What ought to be crystal clear to twentieth century Lutherans was not even a problem for those in the nineteenth!

In passing, all of us who are conscious that the words of Scripture are inspired by the Holy Ghost ought to see that this inspiration has its necessary limitations. Biblicist that Henry Eyster Jacobs was, there was a limit to his Biblicism. I here set down a passage from the *Elements of Religion* that might be read by some American Lutherans who make the sacred writers sons not of their own time, as they were, but strange creatures who, if they did not anticipate every discovery of the present and every possible discovery of the future, could not have written any thing incompatible with these discoveries.

> We claim for the Holy Scriptures absolute inerrancy with respect to all theological truth; we repell any suggestion or suspicion of deception, or error in the strict sense of the term, even on those subjects which only form the framework, but not the contents of the record of revelation. . . . Writers were not inspired so as to speak with scientific precision when they employed their human knowledge of geographical or chronological details, in unfolding to unlettered men the revealed truth with which the entire range of human facts was connected. . . . The Holy Spirit, in making the sacred writers infallible recorders of the hitherto unknown will of God towards men, in no way inspired them to be teachers of astronomy, or geology, or physics. These spheres do not belong to revelation. No number of contradictions that could be gathered within these spheres, would in the least shake our confidence in the absolute authority of Holy Scriptures as the infallible test of theological truth, an inerrant guide in all matters of faith and practise.[15]

Other indications, however, are not wanting that Dr. Jacobs was satisfied to follow the old paths in the formulation of his own Dogmatics. He was not to be a theological innovator; the old way was the best. In the *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, of which he was co-editor, a short article appeared on Dogmatics. It was written by Dr. R. F. Weidner of the Chicago Seminary and shows some acquaintance and appreciation of the nineteenth century

14 Pp. 185-92. Compare also p. 29.

15 I may be pardoned for a further digression as well as for this long quotation. It would be well to have these words printed for distribution when Lutherans meet together in inter-synodical conferences.

approach to Lutheran theology. In Dogmatics, the Scriptural doctrine is "most fully developed, as this is established in the experimental consciousness of the delineator." Further, in defining Dogmatics, Dr. Weidner gives, as the best definition, one by Luthardt. "Dogmatics is the science which presents, in their connections and mutual relations, the doctrines which it has as its aim to reproduce from the religious faith of the Christian himself in harmony with the Scriptures and the teaching of the Church."

Dr. Weidner had gone too far when he gave that much ground to a theology that did not neglect Christian experience, save to give it lip-service. There was a supplementary note added to what he had written. It read in part: "Every dogma, therefore, has three elements, viz., first, a Scriptural, . . . secondly, an historical, . . . and thirdly, a philosophical. None of these are to be overlooked in any adequate treatment." There is no mention of Christian experience, and the supplementary note is signed "H. E. J."[16]

It cannot be denied that there is a surprising lack of unity in the work of Dr. Jacobs. This cleavage might even be termed a kind of incipient theological schizophrenia, were those terms not wedded too much to psychology. This lack of integration—perhaps that is the best way to describe it—can be seen in his introduction written for J. A. W. Haas's work on *Biblical Criticism* (1903). In this introduction subjects are discussed with untrammeled frankness as to whether faith in Christ depends upon faith in the Bible or whether faith in the Bible depends upon faith in Christ. Dr. Jacobs inclines to the latter part of the question and admits that the older apologetics leads to the elevation of the Bible above Christ. Religious truth has its own self-evidencing authority. "It is upon this that foreign missionaries rely in preaching to the heathen."

> The methods not only of the pulpit, but also of the Sunday School, have regarded the Bible too much as a mere store house of edifying but isolated texts. . . . A text from Genesis and one from John, one from the Psalms, and another from Romans, cannot stand upon the same footing. . . . Many a precious passage in the Old Testament can no longer be used as the sincere expression of the Christian faith in the light of the clearer revelation of the Gospel.

This is indeed a different Henry Eyster Jacobs from the one who wrote theology in the manner of seventeenth century Lutheran Orthodoxy. Here is one who does not hesitate to speak of "progressive revelation." John Gerhard would never have said that! Let me quote some more of this introduction as it is not generally available to the ordinary reader.

> The historical portrayal of the life of Jesus in the synoptic gospels, the reminiscences of His wonderful discourses in the fourth gospel, and the explanation of the meaning

16 Pp. 159-60.

of His life and death and resurrection by the inspired theologian Paul, must be carefully discriminated. There are few theorists who would assign the same degree of inspiration to the statistics and rolls in Ezra or Chronicles, as to those parts of the New Testament, for whose reading the dying ask, when all other earthly words have lost their interest. Even the distinction between the Petrine and the Pauline theology, which the Tübingen school so greatly exaggerated, contains within it an element of truth, when the difference is found to be one of degree, but not one of kind.

This was the *grand tour* of Dr. Jacobs in the field of Biblical criticism and the only appreciation that I have been able to find for the work of countless, tireless men in the fields of higher and lower criticism. It is to be regretted beyond the telling that these insights here expressed never found their way into his theology.

In 1905 Dr. Jacobs published his *opus magnum,* the *Summary of the Christian Faith.* No one can measure the influence of this book, for there has scarcely been a work on Lutheran Dogmatics published in English subsequent to it that has not felt its influence. All of the others have abandoned the question and answer method that Dr. Jacobs employed, but the *Summary of the Christian Faith* answered questions that the other books might never have asked or, if they had been asked, might have left unanswered.

Two questions arise as we open this book, one in regard to its method and the other concerning its contents. Dr. Jacobs was little concerned in regard to what we might call *dogmatography*—the science of writing systematic theology. Consequently there are no real prolegomena here (or elsewhere) to his Dogmatics. That shows how little Dr. Jacobs was influenced by interests that were held in his day by European Lutheran theologians.

We do find the distinction, one held quite tenaciously, between *Biblical* and *dogmatical* theology. This distinction is developed, as far as any distinction can be developed with the question and answer method, by resolving Protestant Dogmatics into three component parts: (1) Holy Scriptures, (2) Historical Circumstances, and (3) Technical Terms. The last are determined by current philosophy. Of course, the only philosophy that Dr. Jacobs seems to have cared about was a kind of decadent Aristotelianism. The place of Christian experience, as we have anticipated, was summarily dismissed.[17]

17 In 1914 Dr. Jacobs discussed the "principles of theology" in *The Lutheran Church Review.* In this discussion there are a few striking statements like this one: "A passage of Scriptures torn from its context may be anything else than the Word of God" (p. 4). The discussion of the relation of faith and reason sounds more like a schoolman of the Middle Ages than a follower of Martin Luther. While fuller than in the *Summary of the Christian Faith,* the dicta of dogmatography are essentially the same. The Church Review of 1884, with the inaugural address, would hardly recognize that of 1914.

The *Summary of the Christian Faith* follows the method of the old theologies with the traditional *loci* of Lutheran Orthodoxy. It is a necessary presupposition to the study of the Christian faith that the Bible is the Word of God. The first requisite, then, for apprehending the meaning of the Scriptures is "faith or the state of mind which takes God at His Word, even when it can not explain difficulties inherent in the language of Scripture" (p. 10).

Here we find the weakness of the old *loci* method, and Henry Eyster Jacobs and almost a score of other American Lutheran theologians did not recognize it, or, if they did, thought it not serious enough to abandon the method. This method always began with an unwarranted presupposition that must either be rationally defended or accepted on the ground of faith, which often amounted to mere credulity. Dr. Jacobs makes little of rational proofs to establish the presupposition that the Scriptures are God's Word. He is content with the affirmation of faith. He fails us, however, in the proper analysis of this faith.

Of course, Dr. Jacobs treats of another kind of faith in another place, in the treatment of another of his *loci.* That faith is God's gift and is enkindled in men's hearts by the Holy Spirit through Word and Sacrament. That is really the only kind of faith a Lutheran can ever know, worked in men's heart by the Spirit *ubi et quando visum est Deo.* For the time, however, that need not be considered. But this *nameless,* indefinite faith, this pious credulity which affirms the truth of Scriptures, will suffice as one begins to take up the various "commonplaces" that are found in the *Summary of the Christian Faith.* This method is a far cry from the hope envisaged in the inaugural address twenty years before!

Some consideration ought to be given to the contents of this work. But it would be difficult to show that it was essentially different in content from the Dogmatics of the seventeenth century. Naturally the American scene caused a change of emphasis here and there. The end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries saw new problems arising that the old dogmaticians never faced. These problems, as has been indicated in references made to Biblical criticism, never affected Henry Eyster Jacobs.[18] Civil government on the American continent demanded a different treatment of the state from what Quenstedt knew, but such differences were for Dr. Jacobs of only minor importance. However, the use of proof texts is more restrained than in many Dogmatics even of his own

18 "Neither Hegel nor Kant, neither Schleiermacher nor Ritschl had any influence upon his theological thinking. . . . For the same reason he was not the least disturbed by the many radical changes which during his own life time literary and historical criticism had wrought in the field of the scientific study of the Bible." This was how Dr. H. E. Jacobs was viewed by his colleague, Dr. H. Offermann; *Lutheran Church Quarterly,* January, 1933.

time. The doctrine of the Trinity is not proved from the Old Testament; it can only "be faintly traced" there (p. 41).

It is unfortunate that Dr. Jacobs had such little regard for European Lutheran theology that was contemporary with him. This particularly was the case with the great Lutheran theologians of the Erlangen school, especially von Hofmann (1810-1877) and Frank (1827-1894). There is no evidence that Kierkegaard (1813-55) had the slightest influence on him. He wrote an article on Hans Larsen Martensen (1808-84), but there is no kinship of ideas or affinity of spirit.[19] Had Dr. Jacobs appreciated these men as he did Chemnitz and Quenstedt, he might have introduced something of their method and genius into American Lutheran theology. Thereby he would have delivered it—at least for a remnant of elect souls—from the bondage of its outworn, half-Aristotelian, Lutheran scholastic method though its content of evangelical truth would have been preserved.[20]

With the completion of the *Summary of the Christian Faith*, Dr. Jacobs to a great extent rested from his labors. *Locuto illo, causa finita.* There were no changes to be made. Looking back, it is quite apparent that a kind of *rigor mortis theologicae* had set in. The first sixty years of his life were well spent and his labors had been abundant. During the almost thirty years remaining, he produced no great work though he was busy writing and teaching. The production of the Common Service Book occupied much of his leisure time and great credit is due to him for this work.

It is hard to account, humanly speaking, for Dr. Jacobs. He had come from a background where men were interested in theology and where theological controversy was rife. Early in life he came under the influence of Charles Porterfield Krauth, and from him he must have received stimulation to study at first hand the old Lutheran masters. His formative years coincided, on the other hand, with the years of greatest productivity on the part of C. F. W. Walther (1811-87). It is doubtful, however, whether Walther ever influenced him, save in a most general way. Dr. Jacobs seems to have done his work, hardly conscious of his middle-western brethren,

19 *Lutheran Church Review,* Volume 3, 1884.

20 It might be answered that had Henry Eyster Jacobs done this, he would have been a lone spirit, misunderstood and without influence. Dr. Offermann (*Quarterly,* 1933, p. 6), on the other hand, declares that Dr. Jacobs gave a satisfying answer to the question that was uppermost in the hearts and minds of students, pastors, and people: What is true Lutheranism undefiled and uncontaminated by foreign influences? What is genuine Lutheran faith and doctrine? What is Lutheran theology in its purity and fullness as it was once understood, interpreted and expounded by the confessors of the sixteenth century and by the theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries? In his own theology, Dr. Offermann continues, Dr. Jacobs gave back to the church of his time many of the rich treasures of the past, which had been either forgotten or ignored. Thus he made it possible for the church of his time to train and ground her future ministers in sound Lutheran faith and doctrine.

save that their presence added the weight of numbers to Confessional Lutheranism.

Dr. Jacobs was the product, however, of many things that ought to be enumerated—of God's grace, of those formative years at Gettysburg to which he turned again with much affection in the evening of his life, of the Epistle to the Romans which became the theme of many lectures and the subject of an excellent commentary, of the works of many theologians but particularly those of Martin Luther and Martin Chemnitz. By these and by many other forces and personalities, his genius was ennobled, tempered, refined for the work of the church he loved and knew in her doctrine and varied life, in her liturgies, theologies, and hymns. All of this helped make Henry Eyster Jacobs the man and friend that he was!

COURAGE TO FACE THE FUTURE
(John xiv)

RAYMOND T. STAMM
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

WORRY about what is going to happen next has always been the common burden of mankind, and the urge to pry open the secrets of the future is inherent in human nature. Particularly in times of social chaos the world is flooded with religious tracts which claim to have the key, but only mislead the people. Advent season is a good time to set people straight concerning the coming of Christ, and to transmit to them, through the medium of the Word, the power and the courage to face the unknowable future as Christians ought to face it.

Christ never promised his Christians knowledge of the future, but he gave them something far better: the power of the Holy Spirit to be his witnesses throughout all the world (Acts 1:6-8). That power, and the courage which it produces, is the theme of the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John. Since there are few passages in Scripture so well adapted to set at rest men's anxiety about the future, it is our purpose to present an interpretation of this chapter with a view to its use as an Advent message. The content of the chapter is analyzed accordingly:

I. The Assurance:
   A home in the Father's house of many mansions (1-7).
II. The Manifestation:
   In doing greater things than Jesus did (8-14).
III. The Helper:
   The Spirit of Truth who resides in the heart (15-21).
IV. The Coöperation:
   Between God and Christ and the Christian in erecting the heavenly mansions (22-24).
V. The Revelation:
   Concurrent in the school of the Spirit (25-26).
VI. The Legacy:
   Peace, power, and progress against the Prince of this world (27-31).

I. The Assurance

Verses 1-7. The chapter opens with a double imperative: "Believe in God, believe also in me." The noun *pistis,* faith, does not occur in this

Gospel: in his grammar of the Spirit it is the verb in the active voice. Faith as mere belief or passive assent to a series of propositions about God and Christ is a caricature of what John means by believing. To believe in the Johannine sense requires more than to trust God and Christ and accept passively the salvation offered by God's grace. In this Gospel there is mutuality between believing and doing. Believing in God and doing his will are concurrent actions, each impossible apart from the other. The branch cannot bear fruit without remaining in the vine and it cannot remain in the vine unless it is producing the grapes of the Spirit. Nor can the believer know the truth without doing the truth (Jn. 7:17). The basis of Christian assurance is the Christian action which is produced by the Spirit of God who dwells in the heart.

The equivalence of belief in God and belief in Jesus is not the question at issue in this chapter. The disciples were concerned because Jesus was going away. The question "Where?" taken only spatially, was what troubled them. They had to learn that the Father's house is God himself in whom we live and move and have our being. Expressed in terms of space, this would mean that God is a sphere of infinite radius whose center is everywhere. And so, since mortals must needs think in terms of time and sphere, the friends of Jesus are assured that

> Somewhere, surely, afar,
> In the sounding labor-house vast
> Of being, is practised that strength,
> Zealous, beneficent, firm!

which his servants have developed on earth.[1]

The Greek *monai,* translated "mansions," means literally abiding-places. The root of the word is *menein,* to remain, and the noun is "a place in which to stay." The same noun is used in verse 23, where it ought to be translated "make our mansion with him." When a man loves Jesus and keeps his word, the Father loves him, and there, in that moment, a heavenly mansion is built, no matter where, in the infinite reaches of space, the man may be.

The Father's house contains many mansions. Astronomers estimate a thousand million million million stars: "Two million million stars must already be surrounded by planets, and a new solar system is born every few hours."[2] Surely then he can be trusted to provide places for the soul to lodge, suited to each stage of its eternal development; for his house is more

1 Matthew Arnold, "Rugby Chapel."

2 "Is There Life on the Other Worlds?"—*Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, 1942,* p. 149.

than we ordinarily think of as heaven. This earth is one of its many mansions, marred though it is by God's unruly children who have not yet learned the ABCs of housekeeping.

The moment which we call death is then simply the opening of the door through which we move from one of God's many mansions into another. Alfred Tennyson has described it in "The Deserted House":

> Life and Thought have gone away
> Side by side,
> Leaving door and windows wide
> Careless tenants they!
>
> Come away: for Life and Thought
> Here no longer dwell;
> But in a city glorious—
> A great and distant city—have bought
> A mansion incorruptible. . . .

God has ample power to provide a place for the growing soul when earth's quarters become too narrow (cf. Ps. 139: 1-18). Jesus and all who unite with him as branches with the Vine remain forever within the sphere of God's love and care. The sheepfold in Ch. X is another figure for this house of many mansions. The fold is God's providence and "neither death, nor life, . . . nor any other creature" (Rom. 8:38-39) can snatch the sheep out of the Father's hand. Herein lies "the assurance of things hoped for" (Heb. 11:1).

Jesus goes to prepare a place. The Greek is *topos,* one of those numerous words in this Gospel which are freighted with dual significance. *Topos* means both place and opportunity, and Jesus is concerned to provide the opportunity as well as the place for the more abundant living:

> He who for men their surety stood,
> And poured on earth His precious Blood,
> Pursues in Heaven His mighty plan,
> The Saviour and the Friend of man.[3]

The Jewish teachers believed that the spirit of righteous men who had died were praying and interceding for people who were still living. There were said to be seven divisions in the celestial Garden of Eden, where the souls of the righteous would dwell. But, while there would be differences in rank among them, there would be neither envy nor strife. Each person

3 Michael Bruce, "Where High the Heavenly Temple Stands," No. 137 in the *Common Service Book of the Lutheran Church.*

would possess his own dwelling and those who on earth had been engaged in the same occupation would live near to each other.[4]

On earth there are housing shortages and unemployment. Men have to live in houses they do not like and wear away their days in uncongenial tasks. And so we long for a better place. But the bare assurance that there is such a place is no sufficient comfort unless we can be sure that we shall feel at home in our heavenly mansions. This means that Jesus has a double task: not only to prepare places for us but also at the same time to be preparing us for the places by training us here on earth to live together generously and peaceably. The only way this can be done appears in verse 23: "If a man love me, he will keep my word." Now Jesus' word is the New Commandment of Jn. 13:34, "that ye love one another; even as I have loved you." Only by daily obedience to this commandment can we develop the habits of living which will be necessary for our happiness in the places which Jesus has gone to prepare for us. Therefore—

> Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
> As the swift seasons roll!
> Leave thy low-vaulted past!
> Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
> Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
> Till thou at length art free,
> Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea.[5]

Unless death were to lift men suddenly into a totally other sphere of existence where the character traits which are described in the Sermon on the Mount are irrelevant, Jesus' task of preparing places for us would seem to imply the continuation in heaven of his labors to reconcile God and man by reconciling men with each other (cf. Mt. 6:14-15). If so, then Jesus is preparing places and opportunities for us by teaching our friends and loved ones who have moved into their heavenly mansions before us to understand and hence to love us better.

The parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk. 16:1-13) suggests what this may mean. There "the sons of the light" are admonished so to conduct their business on earth as to make men their friends instead of their competitors. Then, when their turn comes to enter heaven, they will find some friends already there to welcome them. So it may be that our friends and loved ones who have gone before us are helping Jesus to prepare the places,

4 I Enoch 39:3-8; II En. 61:1-3; cf. Strack, H. L., and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. IV (1928), zweiter Tiel, pp. 1130 ff. See also the closing sections of Plato's *Apology*.

5 Oliver Wendell Holmes, "The Chambered Nautilus."

and that, with their experience of life in the heavenly mansions, they will help us to get settled in our new houses.

The most difficult part of this preparation for a happy life in any of God's mansions is the mutual forgiveness and restoration of broken relationships which alone can make heaven possible for us. This process of mutual forgiveness and reconciliation is generally supposed to end at death. But does it? If it did, we should have to suppose that death cuts a man off completely from the self which he was while on earth, or that it blots out in the twinkling of an eye all the evil there has been in his relations with others, so that only the good will be remembered. But if this were true, one could not understand why Jesus conditioned God's forgiveness of us upon our forgiveness of others (Mt. 6:14-15). Unless there is a carry-over of character from this life into the next, it is impossible to see any real reason why we should have lived this life on earth at all.

On the other hand, if the Christian character traits which are described in the Sermon on the Mount are basic for life in heaven as well as for life in the Kingdom of God on earth, it is evident that creating and maintaining harmony by persuading people to forgive and be reconciled to each other is a basic element in the task of preparing them for their places in heaven. Viewed in this light, the commission to forgive sins which Jesus gave to his friends becomes all the more significant (Jn. 20:21-23).

When Jesus' friends have executed their commission on earth and are prepared for the places which he has prepared for them, he is coming again to receive them unto himself (V. 3). Here the verb is in the present tense of ongoing action. The Second Coming is pulled down out of the indefinite future and described as a present process. Nevertheless our Evangelist does not disregard the older view which appears in I Thess. 4:13-18; I Cor. 15:20-28, 50-58; Acts 1:11; and Mk. 13:24-27. Instead, he puts a new meaning into the verb "come":

(1)	(2)
According to the earliest expectation, Jesus goes away, prepares the places, comes again with the clouds at the end of the world, and raises his Christians from the dead; those who are still living when he comes are metamorphosed into their spiritual bodies and are taken to heaven with those who have been raised from their graves and given incorruptible bodies.	According to the new interpretation, which our Evangelist prefers, Jesus goes away to prepare the places, but comes again in only "a little while" (16:16) in the person of the Comforter, through whom he prepares his Christians for their places and shows the way to himself, which they say they do not know (14:5-6); then, at the moment of their physical death they follow him to the places which he has prepared for them.

John's method was not to drop but to reinterpret the older view; for this was still the only conception of the Second Coming and the future life

which the more conservative, literal-minded members of his church could entertain. So he set his new interpretation by the side of the old and left his readers to choose one or the other as they were able. In so doing he could appeal to those of his contemporaries who were accustomed to think in terms of the immortality of the soul and the continuity of personal existence uninterrupted by death, rather than in terms of the suspended animation of the soul and the resurrection and glorification of the physical body before one could enter heaven.

The Evangelist thus clarified a point which had greatly troubled the apostle Paul: if he should die before the return of his Lord, would he be cut off from fellowship with Him in the interim until the resurrection? That thought was abhorrent to Paul. He did not want to be "unclothed" by death and left in a state, be it ever so short, in which he could not converse with his Lord. What he wanted was to be always with the Lord, and this precisely is the assurance which is given in the promise "that where I am, there ye may be also." In these words, mystical fellowship with Jesus proclaims its triumph over traditional apocalypticism.

But being with Jesus is a task as well as a privilege: "If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be" (Jn. 12:26). Life with Jesus, whether it be in heaven or on earth, is not life in the land of the Lotos-Eaters:

> In which it seemed always afternoon.
> All round the coast the languid air did swoon,
> Breathing like one that hath a weary dream. . . .
> A land where all things always seemed the same.[6]

One cannot be with Jesus, who himself is the supreme Servant, without doing the things which Jesus does. Here on earth the Master is always found in the most difficult places: in the sick-room, in prison, in the hovels of the poor (Mt. 25:31-46; I Jn. 3:17-18). The way to him, and to the Father through him, is the way and the truth and the life of service. That way ought not to be hard to find, for it lies right in the daily task, as near as conscience and duty. Man's difficulty in finding it is due to the fact that he is waiting for a celestial Transport to carry him to the skies "on flowery beds of ease."

The answer to the problem of Thomas is therefore an imperious summons to duty. Jesus is going wherever he is needed, on this earth or in any other of the many mansions in the Father's house; and he is also the Way to the post of duty. Here is another Johannine word with dual meaning: (1) Jesus is the Way by which the soul journeys to God after the death of

6 Alfred Tennyson, "The Lotos-Eaters."

the body; and (2) Jesus is the Way of service here on earth, and the Christian who follows him finds that his eternal life has already begun.

The whole matter is thus lifted from the spatial and the temporal to the higher level of the personal and the ethical. This does not mean that we should try to think away the factors of time and space from the Eternal; for even if that feat were possible, it would be neither necessary nor desirable. Our thoughts of heaven need not be impaled on an either-or: either a quality of life or a place. So much is to be said in reply to the superspiritual folk who tell us to stop thinking of heaven as a place and pay attention to the development of heavenly characters instead. But while refusing the dilemma, we ought still to lay the emphasis upon the purpose of Jesus' departure and think of it in terms of the continuation of his ministry of service. The exact *when?* of the consummation of history remains unknown (Acts 1:7). But the way of the eternal pilgrimage of the soul is made plain, and so too is its destination; for heaven is where Jesus is (v. 3), and Jesus is the Way thither because he is the embodiment of the way of life in the Father's house of many mansions.

The words Truth and Life describe the Way. Jesus is the Way because he is the Truth. But Pilate's bewildered world asks, "What is truth?" To which the poet[7] replies:

There is one road, one only, to the Light:
A narrow way, but Freedom walks therein;
A straight, firm road through Chaos and old Night,
And all these wandering Jack-o-Lents of Sin.

It is the road of Law, where Pilate stays
To hear, at last, the answer to his cry;
And mighty sages, groping through their maze
Of eager questions, hear a child reply.

Truth? What is truth? Come, look upon my tables.
Begin at your beginnings once again.
Twice one is two! Though all the rest be fables,
Here's one poor glimpse of truth to keep you sane.

For truth, at first, is clean accord with fact,
Whether in line, or thought, or word, or act.

Jesus is the Truth *(aletheia)* because he and his way of life are in clean accord with ultimate Reality. The Greek word means that which is not hidden. When the Greek mind asked, "What is truth?" it wanted to see what there was beneath the flux and flow of time and circumstance that

7 Alfred Noyes, "The Road Through Chaos."

was real and abiding and not mere appearance; and so it asked, *"What* is God?" The Hebrew mind put the question this way: "What doth the Lord require of thee?" (Mic. 6:8). The Gospel of John stands at the confluence of the Greek and Hebrew streams of thought. Consequently "truth" is another Johannine word that is freighted with dual meaning: (1) reality in the sense of partaking in the nature of God; and (2) the truth of conformity to the will of God in thought and word and act.

Jesus, being the truth in this sense, is also the Life. He is the Life because he is a person of such character that his very existence becomes the irrefutable evidence and the adequate guarantee of his own immortality; for, if death could put an end to such a person, the meaning of the universe would be more deadly than the riddle of the Sphinx, and human life "a tale of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Again, Jesus is the Life because he gives life. He shares in God's creative process (Jn. 5:17). The God of the Gospel of John did not finish his enterprise in six days of twenty-four hours. By his very nature he was working all the time, and Jesus, acting on the principle of the imitation of God, did likewise; healing the lame, feeding the hungry, creating sight, and giving life. From Cana to his last full measure of devotion on the Cross, he was engaged in turning the water of the old life into the new Wine of the Spirit. And then, on Easter afternoon, he breathed his Spirit into his disciples and said, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you" (Jn. 20:21).

So Jesus becomes Life to his friends by creating in them that mind which was also in himself (Phil. 2:1-11; I Cor. 13, Gal. 5:22-23). He makes them minded to do the things which they see him doing, and these are the things which he sees the Father doing. His mind is the mind of God uttering the Word of a new creation. It is the Logos, and Logos was the word which the philosophers used to sum up all God's creative and ruling powers. In the beginning was this Mind and Christ was the word which it spoke; and without it was not anything made that was made.

Sharing in this creative life, the disciples of Jesus are too busy to waste time in asking "Where?" and "When?" Their lives become a concurrent apocalypse as they walk in his way. The feet with which they walk are faith in him and obedience to his New Commandment. Healed of their lameness by Jesus, they find that he is coming, not again but always, and that he never leaves his friends as orphans on the highway of life. The coming of Jesus to us is the converse of our coming to God through him. He is the door to the Father's house of many mansions, and our enjoyment of the places which he has gone to prepare for us does not need to wait for an indefinite Second Coming. Jesus is here now, and his way, his truth, and his life, having been communicated to his friends, are not far-distant in

time and space; nor are they inconceivably Other than anything we can experience here. They are a present possession, a present experience, a present certainty. Through knowing Jesus to knowing God—that is the "How?" of it; and those who believe in Jesus and obey his commandment do not have to wait for this knowledge until they get to heaven, for they have it already (I Jn. 1:1). It may be "in part," and they may see "through a glass darkly"—but: they see!

II. The Manifestation

Verses 8-14. The Christian's assurance is based upon his present experience of Christ and is manifested in doing the works of Christ. That, according to the Gospel of John, is the only way a man can ever see God.

"See" is another of John's many dual words: (1) to see with the physical eye, and (2) to see and understand with the eye of the soul. The Graeco-oriental mystics of his day were asking, "What and where is God?" and Philip is here their spokesman. For many years our Evangelist had been confronted by the demand of prospective converts to see God in the way that the devotees of the Mystery Cults were claiming to have seen their gods. Back of the request, "Show us the Father," lay also the incipient Gnosticism which John was combatting. These religious movements were hybrids of "philosophical" speculation and ecstatic efforts to climb to heaven on the moonbeams of mystical speculation. Most of their devotees sincerely believed that they had found their way into the presence of God, and their propaganda constituted a specious appeal which the Christian missionaries had to meet, even as the church today has to compete with numerous theosophical and esoteric cults. John called these deities and their cult-leaders "false shepherds" and "thieves and robbers" intent on getting into the sheepfold of the Divine Presence by climbing up some other way than the hard way of Christ the Good Shepherd, who had borne the Cross of Calvary. They were giving the people who were seeking an easier religion a false sense of security.

Even Moses had not seen God in that sense (Ex. 33:12-23). In order to know God, or rather to be known by him, the Hebrew had to walk in the way of the Torah (e.g., Pss. 1 and 15). Seeing God involved the moral factor of obedience to God, and this is the emphasis in the Gospel of John. To see Jesus is to see the Father; but to see Jesus one must follow him. "Come and see" is the gracious invitation but also the inexorable summons. Following Jesus is synonymous with doing God's will and obeying the New Commandment (cf. 7:17). This kind of seeing is believing (Jn. 12:44-45; 14:10-11).

The fellowship of Jesus with the Father which is described in verses 10 and 11 is a fellowship of creative purpose and activity. Repeatedly in this Gospel it is asserted that Jesus neither says nor does anything independently of his Father. All prophets and leaders who came in their own name were false shepherds. Jesus had lived in a fellowship of love with God as Father and of will with him as Lord. "Father" was the most adequate name which Jesus and the New Testament Christians could give to God. They were convinced that every good work which expressed man's highest conception of fatherhood was a manifestation of the nature and will and power of God. Jesus had seen all things and done all things as the Father would see and do them, and the works and words by which he had thus revealed him were signs and symbols of God's presence and power.

Now this manifestation of God through the words and works of Christ and his Christians is a continuous, progressive, present process. The Christian is a man who is always seeing greater and greater things (Jn. 1:50), and so is Jesus (Jn. 5:20). The mind of Jesus in the believer is always inspiring him to do not only the works which Jesus did, but greater works than these! The Golden Age of the church is not the past, but the present and the oncoming future.

To every believer grace is given "according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph. 4:7), and before every Christian is set the example of Paul: "Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect: but I press on . . ." (Phil. 3:12-14). The greater works of Christ's promise have been manifested in the expanding horizons of the missionary enterprise: Jerusalem—Judea—Samaria—Antioch—Ephesus—Greece—Rome—unto the uttermost parts of the earth. They appear in the church's growing conception of the social nature of salvation in Christ and of her corporate responsibility to change the poisonous environment that sours and rots the grapes which the Vine and its branches are producing (Gal. 5:22-23).

Jesus healed a few lepers in Palestine but left to his Christians the greater work through medical science of stamping out the disease. Jesus fed five thousand men one meal and gave his church the greater task of generating the spirit of brotherhood that will abolish poverty and maintain an economic structure capable of supplying the wants of all God's creatures. Jesus forgave and declared the forgiveness of sins and he has committed the continuation of that work to his disciples (Jn. 20:23). But forgiveness apart from the restoration of the broken relationships is meaningless, and God's forgiveness of men is conditioned upon their forgiveness of each other. The sheer volume and the increasingly complex involvements of these sins, as the centuries roll on, make this task of inducing men to forgive each other a greater and ever harder work. Jesus in his short ministry could only

begin it by his death on the Cross, leaving it to his church to make his salvation effective in human society from age to age.

In many of these greater works, such as race and international relationships, the church is still in the kindergarten stage of achievement, and the tragic need of the world is pleading more powerfully than any crucifix of wood or metal to our Christian conscience to grow up and be strong in the faith that can remove mountains. Jesus has promised abundant life to all who receive him, and he will give them "grace for grace" (Jn. 1:16), until they reach the fullness of his stature. Our Gospel reminds us that, in the words of Tennyson's "Ulysses,"

> all experience is an arch wherethro'
> Gleams that untravelled world, whose margin fades
> Forever and forever when I move. . . .
> Push off, and sitting well in order smite
> The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
> To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
> Of all the western stars. . . .

Each day writes a new chapter, each year a new volume in this never-ending Book of the Acts of the Body of Christ, whose canon never has and never will be closed. Each century writes its commentary on all that precede, disclosing ever new meanings and ever greater glories in opening blind eyes and healing lame feet to walk in the way of Christ. Without this perpetual Advent and Epiphany of Jesus through his Spirit indwelling the church, the words and works which he wrought in Palestine would have fallen dead into the tomb of history, leaving to the future a legacy only of echoes and rumors of departed glory.

On the night in which Jesus was betrayed, this glorious future was shrouded in the gloom of their prospective position as orphans of the Cross. They had come to depend on him to make their decisions for them, and now that he was about to go away they were dismayed. Yet it was precisely in this situation that the Spirit was to achieve the greatest of all these greater works, in them and through them. Gradually, in the course of the long, sad days of apparent separation from their Master, they came to understand how expedient it had been for him to go away. Otherwise they would have become spoon-fed Christians deprived of the necessity of making their own decisions—a necessity which is indispensable to the development of firm Christian character. They had to be "put on their own."

In another sense, however, they were not "on their own." Jesus, freed from the limitations of a particular physical body, could now engage, through his Spirit indwelling his Christians, in his universal ministry. Prayer was the new form which their intercourse with him was to assume, and the

range of the requests which he was ready to grant was limited only by the condition that their prayers be "in his Name" and with the object of glorifying the Father in the Son. Christian prayer will be for that, and only for that which is in line with the creative purpose and activity of God as manifested in Christ crucified and exalted to the right hand of God. Such asking is always its own simultaneous receiving. It is a prayer that will never be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the universe.

The followers of Jesus and his Way are not granted a fleshly vision of God; nor can they see him by ecstatic dreaming divorced from moral obedience to him. Instead they are told to look upon the works of God and Christ in history and to believe "for the very works' sake." These works, wrought in the Christians and through them, constitute the perpetual Advent and Epiphany of Christ. They are the concurrent apologetic of the church. They are the only valid apologetic and the one dependable source of courage and power to face the future.

III. The Helper

Verses 15-21. The business of the Christian is to do the work of God, which is, first to believe on Jesus as the Son, Revealer, and Messenger of God (Jn. 6:28-29), and second, to keep Jesus' commandment to love one another (Jn. 13:34; 14:15). The inseparability of love for God from love for man is insisted upon in the First Epistle of John (4:20 and 5:2). God is love, and his love is the cause of our love, but we cannot love God without loving our brothers and we cannot know that we are loving our brothers unless we love God.

What this New Commandment involves is set forth in the acted parable of the Washing of the Disciples' Feet, which may be called the Sacrament of Service. Jesus, "having loved his own, . . . loved them unto the end" (Jn. 13:1). The love (*agape*) of Jesus, as here demonstrated, consists of three elements: (1) Jesus' esteem for his disciples—he calls them friends, not slaves; (2) his service to them; and (3) his desire for their love in return. That is the kind of love with which they are to love him and the Father and each other (Jn. 13:14-16). Its measure is indicated by the words "unto the end."

"End" is a Johannine word of quadruple significance in early Christian experience: (1) the end of Jesus' physical life; (2) the physical death of those who believe in Jesus; (3) the expected end of the present world order at the Second Coming of Jesus; and (4) the last full measure of devotion. It is the fourth of these meanings that is stressed in Jesus' Sacrament of Service. Through this acted parable he speaks to his church: "I have

given you an example that ye also should do as I have done to you" (Jn. 13:15).

Here is the key that opens the door to the presence of God and to fellowship (*koinonia*) with him. Jesus has "gone away," but to those who fulfill this condition there comes "another Comforter" (*Paraclete*). The Greek word cannot be translated without losing something of its full meaning. "Comforter" would not be too inadequate if it were understood in its Latin sense of "Strengthener"; but the trouble is that this word conveys to most readers only the idea of a "Consoler," which, although an important part of the meaning, is yet only a part of it. Other elements of meaning in the word *Paraclete* as it was used in the religious vocabulary of John's day are "Defender," "Advocate," "Mediator," "Sustainer," "Revealer," and "Guide." Our more inclusive word "Helper" is therefore a more satisfactory translation.

This Helper is called "the Spirit of truth" in the dual sense of being (1) the truth, and (2) the revealer and giver of the truth. The man in whose heart this Helper resides, who is united through him to Christ as the branch to the Vine, will live, and move, and have his being in "the Truth." He will be in clean accord with the nature of God and will conform to God's will in thought and word and act.

But in this Gospel it is said also that *Jesus* is the truth. That is why the Spirit is called "another Helper." What John has to say about the Spirit is virtually what he has said about Jesus:

Jesus	*The Other Helper*
1. God gives Jesus (3:16), sends him (5:30; 8:16), and Jesus comes from God (8:42; 13:3).	1. The Father gives the Spirit (14:16; 15:26), and the Spirit proceeds from the Father (15:26).
2. The world does not receive Jesus, nor know him, but only those who believe in him receive him and know him (1:10, 12; 8:14, 19; 17:8).	2. Only those who believe have and know this Helper; the world neither sees nor knows him (14:17).
3. Jesus teaches the truth and leads men to the truth (7:16-18; 8:40, 45-46).	3. The Other Helper teaches and leads to the truth (14:26; 16:13).
4. Jesus does not speak from himself (7:16-18; 12:49-50).	4. The Helper does not speak from himself (16:13).
5. Jesus bears witness concerning himself (8:14), and convicts and convinces the world of sin (3:20; 7:7).	5. The Helper bears witness for Jesus and against the world, convicting and convincing it of sin (15:26; 16:8).

Jesus had so lived himself into the hearts and minds of his friends, and had so revealed to them what God was like, that, from the moment of

his death, whenever they thought of the Spirit of God, they thought of him in the image of Jesus. Superficially considered, his death had separated him from his disciples; but, from the deeper and more intimate point of view, his death was that supreme moment in time when he incarnated himself in his followers and became their glorified Lord. As such he was continuing in them and through them his ministry and his revelation of God and his truth. That is why, in this Gospel, the same things can be said of Jesus as are said of the "other Helper," who is no other than Jesus' other self, that is, Jesus now incarnated in his church. This other Helper is therefore not different from Jesus in nature or in character. Actually, in the experience of the disciples, Jesus had never really left them. He had been with them always and uninterruptedly, and would continue to be with them "forever," thus fulfilling the promise in Mt. 28:20.

"The world," can neither receive nor see nor know this other Helper, and this is the reason: the world refuses to obey the New Commandment. Those who are "of" the world do not love their brothers, and so they cannot and do not love God and Jesus whom God has sent. Our word "theory" comes to us from the verb which is here translated "see." A theory is an induction from experience, and since the world refuses to live as Jesus lived, it can have no experience, no real theory of him. It cannot really see him but can only gaze at him and his church while the film of the centuries unrolls. At the Cross, the world sees, not life and forgiveness, but only "blood and water" from a spear-wound in the side of a crucified criminal or a deluded fanatic. Concerning the Christian sacrament of Regeneration the world asks incredulously, "How can these things be?" The world has no appetite for the Bread of Life and refuses to eat. Nor should one wonder at this, for receiving and eating this Bread is such hard work that even many of Jesus' disciples find it "a hard saying" and walk no more with him (Jn. 6:60, 66). And "Pilate" keeps on asking, "What is truth?" when the only way he can ever find it out is by doing the truth (Jn. 7:17; 8:31; I Cor. 2:1-16).

The friends of Jesus, on the other hand, receive, and see, and know this other Helper because they do his commandments. They really see, not only with the physical eye, but with the eye and the discernment of spiritual experience. To them, the words and works of Jesus during his ministry in the flesh, and the words and works of Jesus through the other Helper who is incarnated in the church are "signs" of the great and ever greater power and glory of God in history. The disciples of Jesus believe and act, and therefore know, the truth. Consequently "the Spirit of truth" abides with them and is "in" them, and their vision or "theory" of him is an induction from their life-long obedience (Jn. 14:20-21). Obedience is the building-material for their heavenly mansions.

Throughout these verses the stress is laid on the present tense of the Christian experience. "I will not leave you orphans" (v. 18, R.V., margin). In interpreting these words, we must remember that the writer of our Gospel had two groups of friends of Jesus in mind: (1) the disciples who were with Jesus in the Upper Room on the night in which he was betrayed; and (2) the members of the church in the year 100 A.D., who had never seen Jesus in the flesh.

(1) In the retrospect of the experience of Jesus' companions on the night of his arrest, verses 18-20 will then be explained as follows: I will not leave you as orphans, deprived of my presence and help. I am coming to you, not at some future time, but now, at this very moment, even as I have been coming throughout all my past intercourse with you. Not for a single second will you be without my presence. In a little while, within a few hours, the world will put me to death and therefore will see me no longer. But you are continuing to see me because I am living on without any interruption by death; and you also, who believe in me, will continue to live, though you die physically (Jn. 5:24; 11:25-26). You will see me also on the day of my resurrection, and on that day you will know that I am in the Father and you in me and I in you.

(2) Translated into the experience of the Christians who were living in the year 100 A.D., and those in subsequent centuries, the meaning is essentially the same: you are not like spiritual orphans, left leaderless and helpless in a vast universe of time and space. I am not an absentee Lord who has promised to come again at some time sooner or later. But now, at this very moment, I am here, and you receive me and obey my New Commandment. I am with you, even as I have been with your fathers and grandfathers. As long as you thus remain in me, I remain in you, and between now and the end of this present world there will never be a time when I and the Father are not with you. That world will continue its opposition which has put me to death by the hand of Pontius Pilate. Because of its hostility to me and my Commandment, it cannot see me, and will claim that because I am no longer present in a physical body I no longer exist and am not the Son of God. But you see me, because you believe and do what I command. Through your experience of fellowship with me, you know that I am alive forevermore, for death could not hold me (Acts 2:24; Jn. 10:18). I am the resurrection and the life, and though in the eyes of men you too will seem to die, there is no death for you, for he who lives and believes in me shall never die (Jn. 11:25-26). Nor will you come into judgment on the Last Day; for, in believing and obeying me and the Father who sent me, you have passed out of death into life and are in present possession of the first installment of your eternal inheritance.

You need not be anxious about the Day of final reckoning for all mankind, for that will be the Day of vindication of me, and of you with me, over against the enemy world. On that Day, as on every other day, from now and throughout eternity, you will know that I am in the Father and you in me and I in you.

This is the whole point of the Gospel of John: the essential experience of the Twelve with Jesus on the night in which he was betrayed is reproducible with greater and greater power in every generation of Christians from age to age (Jn. 14:12; 20:21, 29). But, as verse 21 again reminds us, this Christian brotherhood which spans the ages possesses only one instrument of research into the knowledge of God and the truth of the claims of Jesus. The mutual love between God and Christ and the Christian is the sole means of knowing God. But that means is sufficient. It is the Christian answer to the ancient prayer of Moses: "Show me thy glory" (Ex. 33:12-23). In the love of Jesus for the believer and in the believer's love for his Lord, all the goodness of God appears, and the promise is fulfilled, "My Presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest." This manifestation of Christ in the Christian is the basis of the Christian assurance, and it is also the proof that the Helper, even the Spirit of truth is resident in the heart. And wherever the New Commandment is being kept, there, by divine-human coöperation, a heavenly mansion is being built.

IV. The Cooperation

Verses 22-24. The construction of the Mansion of the Soul is thus a divine-human project. This idea of coöperation between God and man is not congenial to many people today who have reacted so violently from what they call the pride of humanism as to fall into the opposite error of overstressing the concept of God's transcendence at the expense of his immanence in history. It is the fashion among them to speak of God's love as if it were unmotivated in every respect by God's desire for man's love in return. They say that God does not love man because man is worth loving, and that man has worth only because God loves him. But if that were true, we should have to ask why God did not choose to love a horse or a tree and make them as valuable as the genus Homo, whom he would have chosen arbitrarily to save by sending his Son to die on the cross. Moreover, such a view would land us into the starkest predestinationism, and the question of "Judas (not Iscariot)" would be unanswerable on the premise that God is morally good.

"Judas" voices a difficulty felt not only by the Twelve in the Upper Room, but by Christians in our Evangelist's day in 100 A.D. and ever since. The enemies of the church confronted the Christian missionaries with this

objection: If Jesus is all that you claim he is, why did he not manifest himself unmistakably to the whole world instead of only to a handful of obscure persons in a corner of an insignificant province of the great Roman empire? Later, Origen had to answer Celsus on this point, and even today it is a source of trouble for the apologists.

Thoroughgoing eschatologists try to cut the knot with an easy but specious solution. They say that Jesus did not manifest himself to the world because his revelation of God is the revelation of a totally different order of existence. It is not within the stream of history, and can only "break into" it from above. The only thing that man can do when confronted with this revelation is to decide for or against it. If he accepts it, he must do so on faith. The normative factor in man's relation to God is said to be faith rather than love, and the very thought that man's love may really mean something to God is viewed with the suspicion of presumption and pride. "Agape" as God's uncaused, down-coming love for man is set over against "eros" as man's ostensible love for God, which is only self-love trying to lift itself to heaven. This line of interpretation is motivated by desire to defend the doctrine of justification by grace alone, through faith. But, in dealing with the matter of divine-human coöperation, it too often fails to see that a distinction is necessary between the doctrine of works and the doctrine of merit, and that it is perfectly possible for men to work with God in establishing his Kingdom on earth without claiming merit for it and making their good works the ground of their salvation. Such lenses are not imperative for an understanding of the Gospel of John; on the contrary, they are liable to cause those who put them on to see through a glass darkly.

The reason why Jesus does not manifest himself to the world is easy to state but exceedingly hard to eliminate as long as God sees fit to grant to human beings even a small measure of free will. As here used, the word *kosmos* ("world") refers, not to the physical world, but to that element in the human world which is hostile to God and his ways. One of its characteristics is implied in Jesus' reply to Pilate: "if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight" (Jn. 18:36). This world is a fighting world, and because it does not choose to love as Jesus loved, it cannot see Jesus. Verses 23 and 24 only repeat what has been said before (Jn. 1:11; 3:19-20; 14:15, 21).

Jesus stands and knocks; and if the man within will not open, Jesus chooses the Cross rather than to perform a miracle of sovereign power to break down the door. Reverently and humbly, then, we may say that God wants man's love in return for his love. That is to say, God invites man's coöperation. On the basis of the divine-human relationship in which the abundant life consists of mutual love between God and man, Jesus could not

manifest himself to the world as the Son of God because the world refused to coöperate. This fighting world keeps asking Jesus for a sign, but he can give it no other proof of his nature and power than this one word—a verb in the imperative mood: "Thou shalt love." After his resurrection, Jesus appeared only to his friends and not to his enemies, because love for Jesus such as is described in First Corinthians Thirteen is the only convincing proof of immortality. The word of Father Abraham to Dives in torment is pertinent: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets," whose fundamental demands Jesus summed up in two commands, to love God and one's neighbor as oneself, "neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead" (Lk. 16:31). Much less could the world really see Jesus if his Advent were to be on a chariot of cloud (Acts 1:9-11). Only those who are in spiritual rapport with Jesus and coöperate in his creative work are prepared to see him.

Those who love Jesus, and in loving him keep his "word" (*logos*), enjoy a fellowship with God through him which is even more intimate than the idealized experience of the Israelites in the wilderness had been (Ex. 25:8; 29:45). "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt. 18:20), and "in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28). His presence is confined neither to Mt. Gerizim nor to Mt. Moriah (Jn. 4:23), and he works all things for good in coöperation with those who love him (Rom. 8:28, R.V., margin). As Paul expressed it, we have the first-fruits of the Spirit: "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. 8:23, 26). In this coöperation, the power of the Christian to face the future is being applied.

V. The Revelation

Verses 25-26. Concurrent with the ever greater works of the church as the Body of Christ is the ongoing revelation of God in the school of the Spirit. Into the pessimistic assumption that prophecy had ceased because the world was no longer worthy of it, Jesus and his friends injected a new optimism. His Advent brought a clear perception of the nature and will of God, both for the present and the future.

The Jewish teachers and the Greek thinkers shared the feeling that somehow the authentic voice of prophecy was a thing of the past. Under these circumstances, more and more reliance was placed on sacred books, both in Judaism and in the religions of the Graeco-Roman world. The Books were consulted for guidance in every conceivable circumstance in life, public and private.

According to the Jewish conception, the sacred Torah contained all of God's will, and nothing but God's will, for all time to come. All had been revealed to Moses on Mt. Sinai, the later writings of the Old Testament being supposed to have been latent in the Five Books as the oak was in the acorn. Everything the Jew needed for guidance in his daily life was contained in his Scriptures. All that one had to do was to study and act upon them. The Jews had become the People of the Book.

But great and good as was the influence of the Jewish Bible upon Jewish life, the prevailing view of the manner of its inspiration and the methods of interpreting it created serious handicaps for religious growth. The first of these was an involved system of legalistic casuistry. This was necessitated by the fact that a revelation, once reduced to writing, becomes static, while the life to which it is intended to apply continues to change. The great majority of the scribes and Pharisees sincerely sought to know and do the will of God, and they believed that it was all contained in the Scriptures. But they were under the constant necessity of deciding just how the scriptural injunctions which had been written centuries ago were to be applied to their own very different circumstances; and so it could easily happen that what was set forth as the will of God might after all be only the will of the interpreter read into the Scripture and then read out again.

The second drawback of this conception and use of Scripture was excessive conservatism with respect to the past, coupled with a corresponding distrust of present, ongoing religious experience. The scribes and Pharisees had many deeply religious and valid insights which often rose higher on the scale of revelation than some of the things in the Scriptures themselves. This over-hesitance to follow new light resulted in slowing man's growth in the comprehension of God and his will.

Some of the consequences for the social and religious life of the Jews will illustrate the lag which was caused by this inadequate conception of revelation. In the first place, it was one of the principal causes of the crucifixion of Jesus. It was not only bad people, like the worldly Sadducean nobility and the racketeering high-priestly families, who feared and hated Jesus. Some of the best people of the day had a hand in the crucifixion because they believed sincerely that Jesus and his followers were bringing God's wrath upon the nation by their failure to observe the Sabbath and other laws as the scribal theory and praxis demanded. Thus the best people played into the hands of the worst elements of society in nailing Jesus to the Cross.

Another example of the retarding effect of the conception of a closed revelation is seen in the opposition to the foreign missions movement. Paul found himself opposed by the more conservative Jewish Christians

under the leadership of John and James the brother of Jesus. The Old Testament revelation was so closely bound up with the nationalistic chosen-people concept that even Peter wavered on the issue: it required many years of Christian experience to produce his vision on the house-top in Joppa and break down his inherited prejudices. Clearly there was need for a revelation which would be concurrent with changing conditions.

The Christian church claimed the example and the sanction of Jesus for just such a revelation. In his early training in home and synagogue, Jesus had been rooted and grounded in the Scriptures of his people, and throughout his life he found in them God's will for his life. Yet this did not prevent him from criticizing, and even setting aside, those elements in the sacred writings which no longer were adequate to reveal God's will as he with his prophetic consciousness had come to see it (cf. Mk. 7:19b; 10:5). While Mark may have been more radical in this respect than Jesus himself, it is also possible that the writer of Matthew has represented Jesus as more conservative than he was (Mt. 5:17-19). However this may be, one fact is plain: there was something in Jesus that caused men not only to call him a prophet, but to break with much of the old tradition which had its sanction in the written Word of God. In one of its aspects, the primitive Christian movement was a resurgence of prophetism, Christian prophecy being defined not merely as foretelling but mainly as *forth*telling the will of God.

The activity of these early Christian prophets is described and evaluated in I Cor. 12-14; compare further Acts 11:27-30; 13:1-3; 21:7-14; Mk. 13:11; Mt. 10:19-20; Lk. 21:14-15; 12:11-12. If the Judaizers whom Paul was resisting in his letter to the Galatians had had their way, the resurgent spirit of prophecy might have been quenched at the outset. That would have made of Christ a second Moses and the Mountain of the Sermon would be just another Sinai.

Paul and those who shared his view, being guided by the Spirit, insisted on passing the tradition about the words and deeds of Jesus through the alembic of their own personal experience of him and then expressing the resulting revelation in their own way. In one sense, the Epistle to the Galatians is Paul's declaration of utter dependence on the grace of God; but in another sense it is also his declaration of religious *in*dependence of the scribal tradition and way of using of Scripture. Paul did not cut loose from the Scriptures, but he brought them, as he brought all things else, into subjection to "the mind of Christ." What he meant by this mind of Christ in the Christian is set forth preeminently in Gal. 5:22-23; Phil. 2:1-11; and I Cor. 13:1-13.

It was this mind of Christ which gave content and meaning to the Christian conception of the Holy Spirit. Paul thought of the Spirit accord-

ing to Christ. Thus the Spirit came to be associated inseparably with the Christian conscience as it developed in the growing church. The Spirit was the internal monitor of the group and of the individual Christian as a member of the group. The resulting concurrent revelation was guided and molded by (1) the works and words of Jesus as these were being transmitted through the oral tradition, and (2) by the prophetic ideals and hopes as these stood written in the Old Testament (Acts 20:35; I Cor. 7:10-11; 15:1-11; II Tim. 3:16; II Pet. 1:19-21). It was not a static revelation with a closed canon of Scripture, but an ongoing, creative process of the mind of Christ in the Christian and in the church.

Seen in this light, the significance of Jn. 14:25-26 is clear. The Spirit-Helper is continuously present in the hearts of the believers, and not sporadically in crises only, as so often in the Old Testament experience. He is sent by the Father in the name of Jesus, which means that whatever things new and old he has to reveal are congruent with Jesus the Christ the Son of God, with his way of living, and with his saving purpose and activity in creating increasingly abundant life. The Spirit is the Teacher of the Church, and his teaching is a process that is simultaneous in the individual and the Christian group of which the individual is a member.

The process of teaching has three phases. In the first phase, the rôle of the Spirit is to be the Remembrancer of "everything" which Jesus as the Word incarnated has revealed in word and deed. But this was not a mere mechanical recalling to memory as a stenographer would transcribe notes. The writers of the New Testament were not typewriters. Recollection there was, but it was selective recollection determind by the special needs of the Christians for their daily living and motivated and controlled their growing, creative vision of the mind of Christ. This was the second phase. In it the rôle of the Spirit was (1) to suggest ways and means to apply the mind of Christ to the daily problems of life, and (2) to motivate, empower, and secure Christian action in a world of sin. Finally, in the third phase, the rôle of the Spirit was to inspire the faith, hope and love with which the Christians could face the future (I Cor. 13:1-13; Rom. 8:1-39; II Cor. 3:17-5:10). In this sense, the Spirit's activity constitutes the perpetual Advent of Christ.

The function of the Spirit as Revealer appears more fully in the sixteenth chapter of John. Here the situation of the nascent church in a hostile world is presented in the spirit of the prophet Micah (Mic. 6:1-5) as a case in the Court of Eternity. The world is plaintiff, judge, and jury. It accuses the Christians of worshiping a crucified criminal and calls them the scum of the earth, revolutionaries (Acts 17:6-7), and haters of the human race. But the Spirit appears as the Attorney for the defense and tells them what to say in reply to their persecutors (Mk. 13:11). Here his

rôle is to be the Vindicator of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and of the Christians as believers in him and followers of his way; and the outcome of the trial will be a complete reversal of the present situation of the church in relation to the enemy world. That world is destined to find that it is not the plaintiff, jury, and judge, but the defendant; and it will lose its case. The Spirit will convict and convince it of sin because it does not believe on Jesus; of righteousness, because, since Jesus has gone to the Father, his Christians are continuing to do greater and greater works through the Spirit's help; and of judgment, because "the Prince of this world" has been judged already, and the Day of judgment is not far off but a present, inexorable process in which every man judges himself according as he accepts or rejects Jesus as the Christ the Son of God. In this Gospel, then, the church is appealing its case to the Supreme Court of the Future and is confident that, when history shall have run its course, whether it be a hundred or a hundred million years, the Spirit-Helper will have demonstrated that Jesus alone is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

Revelation, according to the Gospel of John, is thus a continuous, progressive, creative process. It appears in Scripture, but it is not locked within the covers of the Bible. It bursts the dikes of every man-made canon and flows on across the centuries, increasing in volume and majesty, until the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea (Is. 11:9). The Gospel of John is itself the boldest and most effective recast of the Christian gospel that has ever been written. Following in the footsteps of St. Paul, the writer contributed mightily to keep the gospel revelation from becoming just another Torah to be handed down after the manner of the scribes. The whole spirit of this Gospel is dynamic and progressive, not static and traditionary. Fidelity to that spirit requires that we think of the Spirit's revelation of the truth in terms of Christian progress in the understanding and application of it.

But there is one thing more to be said. The Johannine conception of revelation, when developed according to its full implications, may even require us, in all reverence and humility, to ask the further question, Is the Truth a fixed quantum, revealed once for all in a particular period of history, or is Truth itself a growing thing, precisely because the God of truth is a living God? To raise such a question is not necessarily to fall into the slough of ethical and spiritual relativity. It is only another way of saying that the labor and turmoil of history and the response of men to God's love may, after all, really mean something to him. "A changeless Christ for a changing world" does state a fundamental truth which must never be given up; but, in the light of Heb. 2:9-10; 4:14-15; 5:7-10, is it an altogether adequate description of Jesus? May we not suppose that the

love which his friends have for him, and the attitude of the world towards him, affect his joy as he prepares "places" for men and continues to go after the lost sheep until he finds them? If, with all reverence and humility, Christians may venture to believe that their love to God is really important to him, and that, if they withhold it, God himself may be the sufferer, their incentive to follow Jesus in creative living will be far greater than when they are exhorted to do their duty only from motives of gratitude and submissive faith. Gratitude, while basic, is not enough. We long for assurance that God will take up and conserve in his own "changeless" Eternity all the good which we have been able to achieve on earth. With that assurance, the Concurrent Revelation which is vouchsafed to the church becomes the headlight which flashes down the future as far as we need to know it.

VI. The Legacy

Verses 27-31. The assurance of the believer's eternal well-being, the indwelling of the Helper coöperating with the friends of Jesus in doing ever greater things, and the revelation that is concurrent with the changing circumstances of the believer constitute Jesus' legacy of peace and power to face the future. In its classical usage, the Greek *eirene* ("peace") meant a state of harmony, freedom from war or strife. In the Septuagint it translates the Hebrew *shalom,* which, however, has a much greater radius of meaning—so much greater that it had vastly enriched the Greek word by the time the Christians came to use it. For *shalom* means total well-being, total welfare of body and soul, implying safety, prosperity, and success in both the "material" and the "spiritual" senses. In short, *shalom* is the equivalent of salvation. It involves reconciliation between God and man and between man and his fellowmen, and out of it grow tranquillity and quietness of mind. In modern Hebrew, *Shalom clekem* means "Good morning."

Now Jesus took this word of wide amplitude and bound up in it his entire legacy of peace. The common greeting, so often so thoughtlessly used by us as a mere "Good morning," becomes a sacramental experience associated with the Helper-Spirit (Jn. 20:21-23). The peace which Jesus breathed into his disciples is all-inclusive, and the interpreter must guard against shrinking its meaning just to make it practicable in this present world where peace, both for individuals and for nations, still lies in the future:

> Peace, perfect peace in this dark world of sin?
> . . . . our future all unknown?[8]

8 Edwary Henry Bickersteth, "Pax tecum," No. 413 in the *Common Service Book of the Lutheran Church.*

The voice of Jesus answers, "Yes"—but: "not as the world giveth." The peace which Jesus gives is not listless freedom from disquietude, anxiety, and struggle. Nor is it the self-centered apathy affected by the Stoic when he finds himself in circumstances beyond his control. The peace bestowed by Jesus does not proudly proclaim itself "Invictus"—

> Out of the night that covers me,
> Black as the pit from pole to pole,
> I thank whatever gods may be
> For my unconquerable soul.[9]

Nor does Jesus' last will and testament include "wings like a dove" to "fly away and be at rest" (Ps. 55:6-8). Jesus does not pray that his Christians be taken from the world, "but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one." The Vine and its branches are not transplanted into a Celestial Vineyard but continue for an indefinite period to be rooted in the soil of earth. There they are to bear much fruit despite the poisonous environment of this present evil world, and the fundamental argument for "the social gospel" is just this: the environment of the Vine must be changed so that it may bring forth more fruit. Hence the peace which Jesus wills to his followers is not the peace of inactivity advocated by that humility which is so proud of its achievement of self-abasement that it prefers to sing:

> Sit down, O men of God;
> His Kingdom He will bring
> Whenever it may please His will:
> You cannot do a thing.

And finally, the peace of Christ that passes all understanding is not an unsteady flame blown about by every breath of trouble. It is not dependent upon military or any other external force to maintain it. The Christians have a more perfect altar than the Ara Pacis of Augustus and Rome, on which the people of John's day were invited to center their hopes.

Jesus is indeed "the Rock of Ages" to whom to cling when the ship is wrecked. But he is also the compass and gyroscope to hold the mariner steady over the Seven Seas to the Port of Life; and woe betide the Christian who sings the hymn as if it permitted him to rest forever on a coral strand

9 This reaction of William Ernest Henley has been parodied by Ted Robinson as "Victus: The Real Truth of the Matter"—

> "I have as far as I can see,
> A very conquerable soul.
> Out of the night that covers me
> I howl with grievous mien and dole."

in the Infinite Ocean. The peace that Jesus gives is the power of the will to sail on, to hold steadily to the course in the stormiest weather, and to do the best of things in the worst of times.

Jesus' legacy of peace is the conviction, deep-rooted in the soul, that God is working all things for good in coöperation with those who love him (Rom. 8:28), and who press forward relentlessly to lay hold on that for which they also have been laid hold on by Christ Jesus (Phil. 3:12-14). It is the peace that takes refuge in God's greatness as Jesus did when he said: "for the Father is greater than I" (Jn. 14:28). And so Jesus' going to the Father is a prospect not for tears but for the utmost rejoicing on the part of those who love him; for they know that it will be his glorification and that they shall be like him, for they shall see him as he is.

But the road over which Jesus must go on his way to the Father is the rugged road of the Cross. How can there be joy and peace to those who must travel on that Via Dolorosa? Perplexed and dismayed at having to suffer vicariously and creatively, Christians through all the ages have been asking that question. Now the way of the Cross does seem to be the negation of peace and joy. But the moment the pilgrim of eternity presses through the narrow gate that opens the only way that can lead to life, there comes into his heart an inward peace beyond all understanding by the man who has never committed himself to this way of life.

The price of receiving and making one's own this legacy of peace and power is therefore to keep on faithfully doing one's duty as Jesus did during the "twelve hours" of daylight that preceded his final hour of victory on the Cross (Jn. 11:9). The first step on the Christian way must be taken by faith rather than by sight; but having taken this first step, one's eyes begin to open, and then as one continues on the path of obedience, the assurance grows that "the Prince of this World" really has nothing in Jesus and in those who follow him (Jn. 14:30). "Scowl fierce as he will," he has not the power to interfere with the shadow on the sundial of life's day of duty.

That was Jesus' experience. When it was night, when one of his closest friends had already betrayed him, and when the rest were about to forsake him and deny him, he still could sing a hymn (Mk. 14:26). By definition, the Christian is one who follows Christ in singing songs at midnight as Paul and Silas sang in jail at Philippi (Acts 16:25; cf. II Cor. 6:3-10). Ability to sing in midnight suffering is theirs alone who know that the Father is working out his saving purpose in, and with, and through them.

When Jesus called upon his friends to follow him in doing his Father's will, he promised them that his joy in creative suffering would be their joy. Their sorrow would be turned to joy, and their joy would be made

full: and no one could take it from them. In his legacy of peace, power, and progress, Jesus did not exempt his Christians from suffering, but gave them strength through suffering. His Spirit, resident in the heart, casts out all fear and stills every palpitation of timidity and cowardice. He tells his friends in advance that the worst is going to happen to them side by side with the best (verse 29), in order that, being forewarned, they may be forearmed (Jn. 13:19), and continue to believe and obey His New Commandment.

As the first Christians viewed the results of Jesus' creative life and death in the retrospect of the years, the conviction grew upon them that God had all along been working all things with Jesus and his church for good. The hour of Jesus' "witness" on the Cross had been the hour of his glorification and of the liberation of his Spirit for a wider, universal ministry. The Cross was not a scandal but a throne.

Actually Jesus had not been separated from his friends for a single moment. "I am going away and I am coming" (verse 28)—both verbs are in the present progressive tense, and their action is simultaneous. In the very act of going away (physically) on the Cross he is coming again as a personal, spiritual Presence and Helper. In this sense the Cross is his Second Advent, and Calvary, Ascension, and Pentecost are concentrated in that single moment of time when Jesus said, "It is finished" and gave up his spirit (Jn. 19:30). In the cycle of the church year, the time intervals between all these events are expedient but unessential. That is why our Evangelist has reduced the time between Jesus' "going away" and his "coming again" to such "a little while."

John's ethical mysticism and his fellowship of love and obedience with his Lord have resolved the perplexities of eschatology. To know the time of the Second Coming and the circumstances of the end of the historical process is no longer important. The task of the church and its members is so to live by the help of the Spirit as to convince the world that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, so that the world may believe and have life in him. To this end Jesus carried out the commandment of his Father (verse 31). And then, through the prayer which he taught his church to pray with him (Jn. 17:1-26), he pleads with his friends to continue his work of manifesting and revealing the Father: "As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world" (Jn. 17:18; 20:21).

As Luther said, each Christian ought to think: "I will therefore give myself as a Christ to my neighbor, just as Christ offered Himself to me; . . . as our heavenly Father has in Christ freely come to our help, we also ought freely to help our neighbor through our body and its works, and each should become as it were a Christ to the other, that we may be Christs to one

another and Christ may be the same in all; that is, that we may be truly Christians."[10]

And so our chapter ends, as it began, with its verbs in the imperative mood: "Arise, let us go hence." The Upper Room is one of the many mansions of the soul, but its windows are always open toward Calvary. There, in the hour of communion, the Christian gains courage to face the unknown future. For the friends of Jesus do not go alone. Hour by hour the other Helper whom the Father has sent in the Name of Jesus speaks his word of peace, power, and progress—"Shalom," that utter well-being which assures them that all is well with them for time and eternity, and that "the Prince of this world" cannot snatch one sheep from the Father's hand (Jn. 10:29-30). Therefore,

> Leaning on Him, make with reverent meekness
> His own thy will,
> And with strength from Him shall thine utter weakness
> Life's task fulfill.
>
> And that cloud itself which now before thee
> Looms dark in view,
> Shall with gleams of light from the inner glory
> Be stricken through.[11]

10 *Works of Martin Luther with Introductions and Notes* (Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Company, 1916), Vol. II, pp. 337-338; from the "Treatise on Christian Liberty."
11 John Greenleaf Whittier, "My Soul and I."

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS IN LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

OTTO W. HEICK
Ellis, Kansas

THE Cross of Christ is the victory that has overcome the world. By His death He has destroyed the powers of evil which enthralled men. The Son of Man, who once was despised and rejected, will come, as He has promised, on the clouds of heaven.

The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

According to Martin Luther, man is justified *in foro coeli.* In the act of justification, God anticipates the verdict of acquittal which He will pronounce as judge of the Last Day. Hence justification has a direct bearing upon eschatology. Likewise Christ, the victor upon the cross, "must reign till He put all enemies under His feet." And just as the cross, in Luther's thought, takes precedence over justification, so the final victory of Christ holds first place in Luther's view of eschatology. The Last Day is to him truly *der liebe juengste Tag* (the dear last day). "Remember," he says, "he who does not long for this day, nor wait for it with heart and soul, is not leading a godly life" (E. 7,144). While he conceives of history as a *kalypsis* of divine glory, the Last Day is "an eternal day," manifesting the hidden majesty of God (146 f.).

It is a universal fact that man's idea of God is intrinsically connected with man's thought of death. Consequently the latter also forms an integral part of Luther's whole theology; in fact, his theology has been referred to as a "theology of death" (Althaus). In the midst of life we are in death. Death is to Luther an encounter with an angry God. (*Commentary on Ps. 90;* E. *Op. Lat.* XVIII, 264 ff.) In Psalm 90, according to the office of the Law, Moses became *Moisissimus,* i.e. "a severe minister of death, of the wrath of God, and of sin." A great difference, Luther holds, exists between the death of animals and that of men. Death in the animal kingdom is something natural and temporal; it is *concreata* (p. 285). The animals were not created immortal. "The oxen, sheep, and all the living creatures perish as God has ordained it according to His good pleasure, without sin, without His wrath (p. 298). But we die because God is justly displeased with our sins, our death proceeding "from the intolerable wrath of God against sin" (p. 267). Hence our death is not merely a corporal death,

but an eternal death for the punishment of sin, implying a misery and wrath almost infinite and eternal (p. 284). But as the wrath of God is conquered in Christ, "the death of His dear saints is a new birth and the day of their death is rightly called in Latin, *Natale*" (E. 21, 256). For the saints of the Lord death is only a sleep (E. 14, 315 ff., 61, 430, *et al.*), though it is a sleep "more profound than in this life" (E. *Op. Lat.* VI, 120). "We shall sleep till He comes knocking at our grave, saying: Dr. Martin arise! Then I shall arise in the twinkling of an eye and shall rejoice before Him for ever" (W. 37, 151).

Luther expressly rejected the Scholastic distinctions between purgatory, *limbus infantium,* and *limbus patrum.* As a matter of fact, the concepts of space and time ought not be applied to the hereafter: "In yonder life a thousand years is with the Lord not even one day, and on the day of resurrection Adam and the patriarchs will feel as though they had still been living half an hour ago. Yonder is not time, hence there are no distinct places there, nor are there either day or night. All things are simultaneous before God (*es ist vor Gott alles auf einmal geschehen*). There is neither a 'before' nor an 'after' there." (E. 18, 267; cf. 14, 315.) "Everybody's death is," as St. Augustine said, "his last day" (E. 1, 126). "We are turned to destruction and return on the Last Day ere we know it, nor shall we know how long we were gone." (E. *Op. Lat.* XI, 306.) To depart this life means to be with Christ. The words and promises of God are the receptacles of the soul. (E. *Op. Lat.* VI, 121.) Yea, dying in faith, Christ Himself "is my bosom (i.e. Abraham's), my paradise, my consolation and my hope" (p. 123). In this way Luther dissolved with one stroke the whole nebulous doctrine of purgatory. By focusing his eyes upon Christ, and the promises of the Gospel, he overcame the Scholastic doctrine of merit and of the uncertainty of salvation.

It is evident that Luther, in holding such views of time and space, anticipated some of the fundamental principles of the Kantian philosophy. According to Kant, time and space are not objective entities, but belong to the mind as forms of perceptive arrangement. Luther even anticipated the very modern view of the dialectic theology when he, like Althaus for example, regarded death as coincidental with the Last Day. In addition to the quotations above, we note the following remarkable sentences in his *Commentary on the Letters of Peter:* "Adam, the first born, is just as near to Him as the last individual to be born before the Second Coming; for God looks at time not according to its duration, but *nach der Quere* (from the diagonal point of view); before Him all things are together at one point. . . . With Him are neither measure nor number" (E. 52, 268 f.). And commenting on the crucial passage of I Peter 3:19, he says: "In yonder life beginning, middle, and end of the world are *auf einem Klumpen* (in one

heap). . . . Before God all things exist in one moment. . . . Hence the first man is as near to God as the last one; all things are coincidental in His sight" (p. 154).[1]

With these statements of Luther in mind, we shall understand why he identified hell with a bad conscience. Hell was to him not a place, but a reality inwardly present. "If Satan had no bad conscience he would be in heaven." (E. *Op. Lat.* X, 375.) To sink down to hell is to be delivered into the terror of the wrath of God. Only after the Last Day will hell also be a "place" for Satan and the condemned. (E. 13, 11; 41, 378 f.)

Against this background we shall also understand why Luther was averse to every sort of metaphysical speculation concerning Christ's descent into hell. As a matter of fact, he never had a fixed "doctrine" on this subject. At times he identifies the *descensus* with the thing which Christ had to suffer in the agony of and as a consequence of death (E. 41,379; 37, 145; *Op. Lat.* XVII, 182). On other occasions—and this seems to be his real view—he conceives of it as a triumph of the Saviour over the powers of evil. (Sermon of Easter Eve, 1532, E. 3,279 ff.; Sermon at Torgau, Easter Day, 1533, E. 20,165.) By suffering hell, the Lord overcame the powers of hell. In this twofold view of the *descensus* Luther was followed by Brenz, Flaccius, Parsimonius, and Osiander. Christ's descent into hell, they said, is a part of the satisfaction which He rendered for our sins as well as of the triumph which He obtained over His enemies, just as His death has a bearing upon both. To be in hell is to experience the wrath of God. (Cf. R. Frank, *Die Theologie der Konkordienformel* (Erlangen: 1886 ff.), III, 446 ff.) But that which the first Lutherans had joined together, a later theology put asunder. While Calvin and his church followed the first line of thought suggested by Luther, Lutheran orthodoxy followed the second.

The first Lutheran who presented a fully developed metaphysical doctrine of the *descensus* was J. Aepinus at Hamburg, who taught that the soul of Christ descended into hell while His body was in the grave in order that He,

1 How essentially "modern" Luther was (against Troeltsch) is also brought out in his illocal view of heaven, as developed in the conflict with Zwingli. In fact, Luther's contribution to the development of the modern world view is not easily overestimated. It made, at an early time, the Lutherans receptive to the new science. Rhaeticus, the first academic professor to teach the Copernican system, began his career at Wittenberg. The first edition of Copernicus' *De Orbium Coelestium Revolutionibus* was published in the Lutheran city of Nuremberg in 1543, with A. Osiander, the noted Lutheran theologian, taking an active part in the project. In contrast to this attitude, the Reformed theologians for a long time continued their opposition both to Luther and Copernicus in the interest of a narrow Biblicism. Blame for the fact that this same sort of "mouldy" apologetics later gained ground also among the Lutherans should not be placed on the Reformer. "Its mother was," W. Elert remarks, "the English apologists of the eighteenth century, and its grandmother the (falsely so-called) modern *Weltanschauung* of Calvinism." See *Die Morphologie des Luthertums* (Münich: 1931), I, 365.

by suffering the pains of hell, might redeem us from the powers of hell. True, in the second stage of his teaching, Aepinus made a distinction between *gehenna,* the place of the condemned who have rejected Christ, and the *infernum,* the place where men suffer as a consequence of original sin. Consequently Christ, in the words of Aepinus, suffered not the pains of *gehenna,* hell proper, but only those of the *infernum.* The Formula of Concord (Article IX) rejected Aepinus, but reaffirmed the simple and sober views of Luther.[2]

To sum up, there is no place for an "intermediate state" in Luther's eschatology. He was interested not in the "immortality of the soul," but in the consummation of the world. The key words in his eschatology are the Last Day, resurrection, and eternal life. In other words, Luther's hope is an eschatology with the Kingdom at its center: THY KINGDOM COME!

2 A brief review of the controversy between Strange and Althaus over Luther's conception of the immortality of the soul should find its place here.

Throughout his long career Carl Stange, of Goettingen, was consistent in opposing the tenets of ethical idealism as detrimental to evangelical Christianity. In keeping with this, he time and again pointed out that in Luther "flesh" and "spirit" do not denote a lower or higher part of man. Luther's psychology is not dualistic as was that of the Scholastics. To him "flesh" signifies the whole man in his natural opposition to God, while "spirit" means the whole man born again by the Spirit of God. From these premises Stange concludes that Luther denied altogether the immortality of the soul, and that the term "second death" means annihilation to him. Here is the point where the ways of Stange and Althaus part. While subscribing wholeheartedly to Stange's interpretation of Luther's psychology, Althaus maintains that the contention of Stange is not germane to the words of Luther. Agreeing with Stange that there is no such thing as a natural immortality of the soul, he argues that Luther nevertheless believed in the "immortality of the godless," i.e. the latter also shall be raised up on the Last Day and maintain their personal identity forever.

One of the principal passages in dispute is Luther's remark regarding the resolution of the Fifth Lateran Council: "Finally it happened that . . . they deemed it necessary at the latest council to establish by decree that the soul of man is immortal." According to Althaus, Luther opposed this decree because he regarded it as a matter that stands to reason, while, in the eyes of Stange, Luther registered his opposition because he rejected the sentence as contrary to the Christian faith.

Venturing a word of criticism, we believe that Stange is more sound in the interpretation of individual passages, while it remains to us exceedingly doubtful that Luther should move here in the company of the esteemed professor at Goettingen; for in analyzing the argument of either scholar it is evident that both men are prone to claim Luther as a principal authority for their own views concerning the matter under discussion. This much, we believe, is clear, that Luther did not hold to the popular notion of immortality. He did not regard death as a liberation of the soul from the prison house of the body, and immortality was to him not a natural endowment of man, but a charism of God (Rom. 6:23). Lutheran theology, therefore, would do well to remove the word "immortality" from its vocabulary because it is freighted with un-Biblical notions in the mind of even Christian people. The hope of the Christian is centered, not in the immortality of the soul, but in the resurrection of the dead and the life everlasting.

A significant change of emphasis took place during the century following the Reformation. Drifting away from Luther, the theologians approached the position of Calvin. The great theologian of Geneva had arrived at a fixed doctrine on the point under discussion. The soul of man, he held, is immortal and is "the nobler part of him" (*Institutes* I, 15, 1). The earth is but a "sepulchre" and the body a "prison" (III, 9, 4). He regarded it as a "brutish error" to hold that death should affect the soul. Rather the soul survives in death, retaining its existence in Paradise (III, 25, 6), and when Scripture says that the dead are "asleep," this, he maintains, refers to the body only but not to the soul. (*Commentary to I Thessalonians,* 4:13.)

The teaching of the Orthodox theologians is practically identical with this view of Calvin. Like him, they have a fixed set of doctrines and they are agreed with him in his thoroughly dualistic Platonian view of man. Among the scholars of this school, L. Hutter (d. 1616) kept himself considerably closer to Luther than the men of the period of high orthodoxy. Following the example of Luther, he maintained that the souls are "in the hands of God," adding that they wait there for the glorious resurrection of the body and the full fruition of eternal blessedness. (Cf. Calvin's *Institutes* III, 25, 6.) In the next generation J. Gerhard (d. 1637) is interesting. He was much perturbed about the Catholic teachers who classified Luther with the "psychopannychites." Trying hard to explain away the real force of those sentences in Luther which refer to death as a sleep, he declares that death is not sleep for the soul. The same thing was emphasized half a century later by Quenstedt: "The souls of men separated from their bodies do not sleep nor are they insensible."

On the doctrine of purgatory, however, these men remained in complete harmony with Luther. Any yielding here they would have regarded as a betrayal of the central article of the Reformation, i.e., justification *propter Christum, sola gratia.* Hence they rejected the Catholic teaching of intermediate repositories and thought of the souls of the pious as carried immediately into heaven and those of the condemned as suffering at once in hell. For this reason they regarded the hour of death as of profound significance, settling once and for all the eternal destiny of a person. This view, however, did not lead seventeenth century Lutheranism to deny salvation to all who had not been afforded an opportunity of hearing the Gospel in their lifetime. Holding that God, at the final judgment, will "render unto every man according to his deeds" (Rom. 2:16), they maintained that there is hope also for the Gentiles, and when we keep in mind their teaching that Christ upon the cross rendered a perfect satisfaction for all men, it cannot be truthfully said, as it has been done at times, that this teaching is contrary to Scripture and the analogy of faith. For according to the New Testament, faith justifies not because it is a human achievement which

makes man acceptable before God, but because it apprehends Christ who, as St. John writes (I John 2:2), "is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world." They departed from the New Testament and Luther, however, when they elaborated on the blessedness which the pious even now enjoy in heaven and the present suffering of the condemned in hell, thereby making the New Testament view of the resurrection and final judgment practically of no account. For if the pious souls enjoy full communion with God prior to the last judgment, what meaning is there in this judgment or what added glory can the resurrection bring? Hence the Christian hope became progressively more centered in the immortality of the individual, while the desire for the consummation of the world was pushed into the background. We probably overstate the case when we say that the eschatology of the seventeenth century was purely individualistic. If nothing else, the horrors of the Thirty Years War surely kept the hope for the Second Coming alive, as witness the two great hymns, *Es ist gewisslich an der Zeit* (the day is surely drawing near) by Ringwaldt, and Philip Nicolai's "Wake, awake for night is flying." Yet Althaus is undoubtedly right when he makes the complaint that the seventeenth century failed to give the church any lasting hymns on the resurrection, and we may add that the rubric, "hymns of the resurrection," is still one of the weakest sections in all Lutheran hymnals.[3] This failure indicates a deplorable impoverishment of the Christian hope, and its effect has been that our preaching at a funeral revolves about individual immortality. The great collects in our Lutheran ritual are omitted in many instances and are seldom appreciated.

The same tendencies toward a spatial view of the hereafter are noticeable in the teaching of the *descensus ad inferos*. It is now quite generally regarded as the first step of Christ's "state of exaltation," being defined by Hollatius as "a true, real, and supernatural motion" by which our Lord, in His whole person, descended into hell. On the basis of I Peter 3:19 a distinction is made between the vivification and the resurrection, with the *descensus* assigned to the few intervening moments early on Easter morning. As to the effect, it is said that Christ triumphed over the demons and that He intended to convince the condemned that they are rightly held in the infernal prison. Here, too, the difference between Luther and the seventeenth century theologians is considerable. Luther's insight into the non-spatial and non-temporal nature of eternity was seemingly effaced from the theologians' memory.

The dogmatizing tendencies of that age are furthermore evident also in its teaching of the Anti-Christ. Luther, who confidently believed that the

3 There are only two such hymns in the Common Service Book, of which the second one, No. 512, is historically not a hymn of the resurrection, but an Easter hymn. The *Kirchenbuch* of the old General Council does not even have such a rubric!

end of the world would come in the sixteenth century, had occasionally referred to the Pope as the "very Anti-Christ" (*Smalcald Articles, etc*). But this view was to him not a dogma, since he applied the same designation to the Turks, who in his time were the chief political power menacing the Christian civilization of the west. Hence he had taught the church to sing: "Lord, keep us steadfast in Thy word, restrain the murderous Pope and Turk!" In the seventeenth century this historical and religious judgment was turned into a fixed dogma. But the end of the world had not come in the days of Luther, and consequently the theologians were compelled to substitute a corporate conception of the Anti-Christ for the personal and individual view held by Luther. The papacy, they now taught, is the Anti-Christ. This doctrine, as the reader will notice, is still normative for the Missouri Synod.

The Eighteenth Century

Pietism and Rationalism were the two leading movements in the church of the eighteenth century. Pietism is a religion of experience. Consequently the eschatology of the Pietists represents a sensualistic conception of the Last Things. Rejecting the Orthodoxist doctrine of the wrath of God, the radical wing (G. Arnold, J. W. Petersen and his wife, Johanna Eleonora, J. G. Dippel, *et al.*) espoused Origen's teaching of the restoration of all. Most of them also taught the millenium. The conservative wing (Halle) naturally exercised greater restraint in accepting the "new theology." As to the millenium, Spener expressed his faith in "better times to come for the church." The most significant exponent of Pietistic eschatology was the Württemberg theologian Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752). It was mainly through him that chiliastic speculation became a favorite subject of Lutheran Pietism both in the eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries. Bengel's interpretation of Revelation was a compromise between the continuous-historical view of the preceding centuries and that of a purely futurist system. Believing, like the Orthodox theologians, that the seven headed beast of Revelation signifies the papacy of many centuries, he regarded the seventh head as an individual, the Anti-Christ proper, to be revealed in the future. On the basis of a complicated arithmetical speculation, he expected the millenial reign of Christ to commence in 1836. As to its nature, he conceived of it as a reign of Christ in heaven, leaving the natural or earthly life essentially unchanged.

How may we explain this leaning of Pietism toward chiliasm? That chiliasm is not a constituent element of a fervent piety is proved by the attitude of the Reformation. In addition to the sensualistic nature of the movement, already referred to, we must keep in mind that Pietism represents

a Biblicism which is historically oriented (cf. the "federal theology" of Cocceius). While the historical approach to the Scriptures may lead to a destructive relativism, as shown in modern liberalism, it may also produce, in its uncritical stage, a theology that is apt to put every statement of Scripture on the same level. To this sort of theology the futurist expectation of the millenium in Revelation 20 is so self-evident that it dare not reject it. Its representatives look upon the church's view of the passage as disobedience to the Scriptures. On the other hand, the theology of the Reformation (and of the Orthodoxist period) is a "system" in which the whole is organically related to what it regards as the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,* i.e. justification by faith. In this system there is no room for a new "dispensation" which would interfere with the present *ordo salutis.*[4] The strength of Orthodoxist theology is to be seen in its systematic integration and logical completeness, while its exegesis, in many instances, is weak and unsatisfactory. Bengel and his school, on the other hand, reversed the order. His *Gnomon* and Hofmann's *Schriftbeweiss* are landmarks in the interpretation of Scripture. Likewise, today, Missouri's firm stand against all sorts of chiliasm is rooted in a deep insight into the nature of Biblical revelation, while its interpretation of Revelation 20 will hardly convince anyone who is not already convinced.

In contrast to Pietism, *Rationalism* discarded entirely the eschatological hope of the New Testament as an "accommodation" of Jesus and of His apostles to the apocalypticism of their Jewish contemporaries, replacing the Biblical concept of eternal life by the philosophical notion of individual immortality and the supernatural concept of the Kingdom by the immanental idea of progress. In this philosophical and secularized form, eschatology became a part of the system of Kant and of the great philosophers of German Idealism; and in its thoroughly materialistic-eudaemonistic version, the millenial hope lies at the bottom of the teaching of Karl Marx, a left wing Hegelian.

The Modern Age

The leading theologies of the following century were thoroughly uneschatological. The nineteenth century was a century marked by a naively optimistic belief in progress. Hence there was no room for such a gloomy thought as that of a catastrophic end of humanity. In Schleiermacher's theology, bordering on monism, the belief in development replaced the Biblical

4 Lutheran Chiliasts have on the whole exercised considerable restraint in their teaching in order not to destroy the permanent validity of the *ordo salutis.* Nevertheless, a revelation of divine glory, even if only partial, would inevitably interfere with the true nature of faith. There is no room for a millenium in a "theology of faith."

teaching of the coming of the Kingdom by supernatural power. As regards the eschatological hope, there is nothing in Schleiermacher except a big "eschatological hole," as Brunner has said. (*Die Mystik und das Wort* (1924), pp. 268 ff.) While in his *Reden* he declined to accept the view of immortality even for the individual, it is this very conception that dominates his discourse on the Last Things in the *Glaubenslehre*.

Like Schleiermacher, Albrecht Ritschl declined to dogmatize about the Last Things. In his conception of Jesus as the "Bearer of God's moral Lordship over men," there was no room for Jesus as the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven. Stripping the Kingdom of all eschatological significance, he regarded it as a community of men under the rule of God, serving each other in love.

In contrast to Schleiermacher and Ritschl, the Erlangen theology showed a marked interest in the eschatological hope, making it a living reality in the consciousness of the church. The Erlangen theology is, in a way, Confessionalism blended with some strong elements of Pietism. The revival of religion in the nineteenth century was in its earlier stages, an interconfessional movement. Thus Hofmann regarded Ch. Krafft, pastor of the German Reformed Church at Erlangen, as his spiritual father. Through Krafft, Hofmann became heir to the mystic and historical approach to theology, mentioned above. He was one of the foremost exponents of what is called a "realistic" interpretation of Scripture. (This view, we believe, is more properly called "sensualistic" because it stresses the fact that the redemptive power of Christ must of necessity become perceptive to the human senses.) This fundamental bias is apparent in his presentation of redemption and justification. Christ overcame in His person the moral limitations of human nature, and by joining us to Himself, He makes us partakers of His victory. Atonement is not through Jesus but *in* Him, and justification is a process by which man is actually made holy. In keeping with this view, Hofmann's teaching of eschatology is thoroughly "realistic." Like the individual, the universe will be subject to the regenerative power of Christ. But in contrast to Ritschl, who gave an intra-mundane, evolutionary interpretation to the reign of Christ, Hofmann's teaching is supranatural throughout. The Kingdom will come, not by evolution, but by revelation. The glory of God will be revealed in time and history. Hofmann's main contribution to eschatology lies in the teaching of an Intermediate Kingdom; it was through him that chiliasm was afforded a chance to establish itself in Confessional Lutheranism. For an explanation of this remarkable fact we must keep in mind his quasi-physical conception of redemption, as referred to. Rejecting the continuous-historical method of interpreting Revelation, as employed by Luther and the older dogmaticians, he accepted the eschatological method without reservation. Consequently he discarded the older view that the Pope is the Anti-Christ and that the millenium is to

be sought in the past history of the church. He held that Antiochus Epiphanes, "the enemy of the Old Testament people of God," will be revealed again at the end of time, and commenting on the number 666 he says, "The Greek language, which is the most beautiful flower of the natural development of the human race, will remain till the end of time. As the Jewish people will remain as the place of the final materialism of the divine economy, so the Greek language will survive to be the speech of the last enemy of God. This will be the final conflict between *Hellenes* and *Ioudaioi*." (*Der Schriftbeweiss*, 2nd edition (1857 ff.), II, 2,703.) This statement is significant, having all the earmarks of a speculative and sensualistic view of history. In the millenium, he says, the reign of Satan will be ended and for a thousand years sinful humanity will be subject to the beneficial reign of the glorified church of Christ. It seems strange to us today that a man of Hofmann's calibre could expect such a course of events prior to the final consummation of the world.

Hofmann's view of the millenium was shared, among others, by Frank, at Erlangen, and Auberlen, at Tuebingen. "Christ, returning in glory, will exercise a visible reign on earth" (Frank). "The Kingdom of God will then be an external power in the world" (Auberlen). "In the millenium the state, art, and education will be genuinely Christian" (*ibid.*). "Israel will return to Palestine and God will restore the kingdom to Judah" (Frank).

The same sensualistic conception of the millenium was preached with great eloquence by J. A. Seiss at Philadelphia: "The general conditions of the earth, and man upon it, will then also be vastly improved." Great and mighty changes will take place "which must needs alter the whole climate, fruitfulness, and inhabitability of the earth. . . . Life will be wonderfully prolonged." Death will be destroyed except in cases "of transgression and disobedience." (*The Apocalypse*, 8th edition (1901), III, 348 f.)

Rejecting this gross view of the matter, others held, after the manner of Spener, a more spiritual conception of the millenium. To mention only one of many, the late Bishop Martensen, of Copenhagen, maintained that the Lutheran Church "failed to apprehend the idea underlying chiliasm, an idea of import, if we understand it as referring to the last form of our Lord's *spiritual* advents in history. . . . There must be some climax the human race and the church may attain to, even *within* these earthly conditions, a period which shall present the highest blossoming and flowering of history." (*Christian Dogmatics*, Engl. ed. (1860), p. 470.) This view had considerable vogue also among the pastors of the old Iowa Synod who had received their training under Loehe at Neuendettelsau. (The university at Erlangen and the imposing charitable institutions at Neuendettelsau were the two main centers of a renascent Confessional consciousness in the Lutheran Church of Bavaria.) Hence it was bound to become a matter of controversy with the Missouri Synod which, rejecting the eschatological interpretation

of Revelation, still maintains that the Pope is the "very Anti-Christ" and that the millenium lies in the past history of the church.

In its gross and supranatural form chiliasm is almost a dead issue in presentday theology. But in a rationalized and secularized form it has captivated the minds of many. In the same way as the atonement is regarded in modern theology as effecting essentially man's reconciliation with God, so Christian society is considered the means of "advancing the kingdom of God." "Our chief interest in any millenium is the desire for a social order in which the worth and freedom of every least human being will be honored and protected; in which the brotherhood of man will be expressed in the common possession of the economic resources; in which the spiritual good of humanity will be set high above the private profit interests of all materialistic groups." (W. Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social* Gospel (Macmillan Company: 1918), p. 224.) Here we have the link that connects the "liberal" theology of America with Marxian socialism and Russian communism. But the Kingdom will suffer no anticipation. The expectation of a millenial reign of Christ in time and history is essentially a "Jewish opinion," as the Augsburg Confession says, and it matters little whether the prophecy is made by Karl Marx, the Jew, or by Henry Wallace, the Aryan. The Kingdom comes neither by revolution nor by evolution, but by revelation only. This fact should keep the churches in a sober mood as to a "just and durable peace" following the present world struggle. Even if Rome or Canterbury casts the decisive vote at the peace table, the "new order" is not a means to hasten the Kingdom, as the *Army and Navy Prayer Book* teaches our soldier boys to pray. There is, in fact, a world of difference between this prayer and that of the primitive church, as recorded in the *Didache:* Let this world pass away and let Thy grace come! The same is true of the hymn, "Rise up, o men of God" (No. 66), which is also found in the *Parish School Hymnal* (No. 289). If Lutherans are going to sing this hymn, they had better follow the parody quoted by W. M. Horton: "Sit down, o men of God, His kingdom He will bring, whenever it may please His will, you cannot do a thing." (*Contemporary Continental Theology* (Harper and Brothers: 1938), p. xvi.) This parody, indeed, is more in harmony with the Lutheran Confessions than the original, for, according to the Augsburg Confession (Art. V), "our God is marching on" not when men are engaged in a war for the abolition of slavery and the preservation of the Union, as our fathers once thought, nor when Hitler raised the German nation from dust and ashes, as the *Deutsche Christen* believed, nor when the United Nations maintain to fight for the "four freedoms" the world over, but rather when He gives His Holy Spirit "who worketh faith, when and where it pleases God, in those who hear the Gospel." In brief, men are neither fit nor able to "bring forth the royal diadem and crown Him Lord of all;" rather Jesus will receive from God the crown, dominion, and glory.

After this digression into modern thought we shall return to the nineteenth century.

Next to the teaching of an Intermediate Kingdom, the doctrine of an *Intermediate State* gained momentum in Lutheran theology. As we have seen, the leading concepts of that century were evolution and development. Against this background, the justification of the ungodly was rarely understood in its full meaning. What is an *act,* according to the New Testament, became a *process;* justification was merged with sanctification.

At the beginning of the century Schleiermacher postulated in his *Glaubenslehre* (paragraph 161, 1) a continued probation after death; for, as he said, "if the believers would be the same ethically that they were at the time of death, sin would also dwell in them at the resurrection." This view of Schleiermacher became normative for many others down to R. Seeberg, who held a chair of systematic theology at the Berlin University a century after Schleiermacher. Postulating a purgatory "not of satisfaction but of grace," Seeberg sided with the ethical idealists against the Gospel of free and unconditional grace. (Cf. Martensen who, in his *Dogmatics,* previously referred to, moves along the same lines of argument, p. 457.)

The *doctrine of the descensus* also underwent a significant change. In contrast to the seventeenth century view, it was now regarded as a means of offering grace to those who are held in the infernal prison, and this redemptive work of the Saviour was said to extend through all ages. The *locus classicus,* I Peter 3:18-20, was interpreted as teaching the universal scope of salvation. Thus the doctrine of a future probation made its way into Lutheran theology. (As to its effect upon the American churches, compare the controversy of the Andover faculty with the American Board for Foreign Missions in D. D. Williams, *The Andover Liberals* (New York: 1941), pp. 65 ff., 183.)

The emphasis on the intermediate state of man reached its climax in the notion of a "temporary, ethereal body" for the dead prior to the day of resurrection, according to the dictum of the Swabian theologian and theosophist, F. Ch. Oetinger: corporeity is the goal of all God's ways. "We must therefore entertain, wrote Martensen in his *Dogmatics* (p. 406 f.), "the idea of some sort of a *clothing* of the soul in the realm of the dead.... But although we are thus obliged to conceive, in a vague way, of some intermediate kind of corporeity in the realm of the dead, this must not exclude the fundamental ideal of that realm as one of inwardness and spirit." What a confused statement: corporeity and yet essentially an inward state of existence!

Ritschl died in 1889. Three years later his son-in-law, Johannes Weiss, published a little volume of sixty-seven pages called, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes.* This book was a landmark in the discussion of the eschatological problem. It is a thorough refutation of the spiritualistic and

moralistic interpretation of Jesus as set forth by Ritschl. The kingdom of God is not what Ritschl held it to be, a moral society under the rule of God, but is the very opposite; it is eschatological through and through. "Son of Man" is a purely eschatological designation of the Messiah. In this way the erstwhile follower of Ritschl discarded the entire New Testament interpretation of his father-in-law.

Others followed suit. Especially Albert Schweitzer must be mentioned here with his two books, *Das Messianitaets-und Leidensgeheimnis* (1901) and the famous *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (first German edition, 1906). Schweitzer's view of Jesus is eschatological throughout. Let it be kept in mind, however, that he, like Weiss, was far from accepting the results of his New Testament studies as affecting his systematic thinking. As to dogmatics, these students of comparative religion remained *Kulturprotestanten.* "The death of Jesus," Schweitzer wrote in 1901, "marks the end of all eschatology. . . . The world in which He lived and moved was eschatological; the Christian view of life which He founded through his death leads us forever beyond the eschatological outlook on life. Such is the mystery in the divine economy of salvation." Stressing in this way the meaning of eschatology for the life of Jesus, Schweitzer removed the concept entirely from his own theology, which is, like Ritschl's, ethical throughout. Cf. his later volumes *The Decay and Restoration of Civilization* and *Civilization and Ethics* (1923).

If everything historical is said to be relative, what place can the historical Jesus hold in our own thinking? How much of his apocalyptic faith is authoritative for us? The crisis in which Neo-Protestantism found itself came to a climax in the life and work of E. Troeltsch, the greatest systematician of the Historico-Religious School. Starting as a pupil of Ritschl, he later discarded entirely the Christo-centric approach of his teacher and established himself on what he called "a rational kernel of religion." In this way he tried to salvage from the debris of his Christian faith what little he could use in rebuilding his *Weltanschauung* on the basis of an unhistorical mysticism. According to him, the apocalyptic faith of Jesus is to be regarded as a mere symbol of a world of eternal values. The Last Things, he wrote in his article on Eschatology in the first edition of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* have nothing to do with time. The human race may die, but the world, as the eternal creation of God, has neither a beginning nor an end in time. The kingdom of God is realized when civilization is brought into union with God.

The First World War dealt a terrific blow to the optimistic creed of Neo-Protestantism. Continental Protestantism turned back from Ritschl and Troeltsch to Luther and Calvin. The spokesman of this movement was Karl Barth. As J. Weiss had rediscovered the importance of eschatology

for New Testament exegesis, so K. Barth reestablished its meaning for systematic theology. In pronounced contrast to the thoroughly uneschatological theology of Ritschl, that which since has become known in America as the Barthian theology is eschatological through and through. To Barth and his followers theology is eschatology. As a matter of fact, the word eschatology is here equated with revelation. Yet Barth could not deny his Marburg training. As Weiss and Schweitzer remained essentially on the level of Ritschl in systematic theology, so Barth remained true to the critical school in his Biblical studies. As regards higher criticism, he certainly is no Fundamentalist. This fact will explain why R. Bultmann, the radical New Testament scholar, became the foremost exponent of Barthianism in the field of the New Testament. (Cf. for example, his article in the Barthian journal *Zwischen den Zeiten, "Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums"* (1928, pp. 4 ff.).

The second edition of Barth's *Roemerbrief* of 1921 may be regarded as the textbook *par excellence* of the dialectic theology. Having found out that "Paul and Plato can go quite a way together," he set up the principle that time and eternity are metaphysical opposites. A history of redemption is to him a *condradictio in adjecto.* Historical facts are nothing more than parables and demonstrations of the divine. Consequently the Fall is not to be regarded as an historical incident but as a superhistorical verity. Likewise the Second Coming is not a spectacular phenomenon in some distant future, but rather the superhistorical, ever-present annihilation of time. Commenting on the famous passage, Romans 13:11-14, he says, "Do nobody's ears tingle? Will the foolish talk not cease that the Second Coming failed to appear? How shall a thing "appear" which on account of its very nature can never "come to pass?" For the end, as foretold in the New Testament, is no occurrence in time, no fabulous *"Weltuntergang"* (end of the world); it stands in no relation to an historical, telluric, or cosmic catastrophe."

The "theology of crisis" was a true expression of the Continental mind after World War I. Barth was in the eyes of many a prophet of a new Christianity. What seemed impossible in the days of Ritschl had become a reality in 1919: the modern theologian found the apocalyptic mood of the Ancients akin to his own *Weltanschauung. The Untergang des Abendlandes* (Decline of the West) seemed, as Spengler held, a frightful reality. For consideration of space we shall not even mention the many publications that dealt with the eschatological problem. The reader will find them discussed in a doctoral dissertation by the Swedish theologian Folke Holmstroem, *Det eskatologiska motivet i nutida teologi* (1933), translated into German, *Das eschatologische Denken der Gegenwart* (1936). For our purpose it will be sufficient if we limit ourselves to two theologians of ecumenical renown: Carl Stange, of Goettingen, and Paul Althaus, Jr., of Erlangen. Stange is

a man of the older generation (he is past 70). His studies in Luther blazed the trail for the Luther Renaissance after World War I. Althaus, an erstwhile student of Stange, holds, since 1925, the chair of systematic theology in the University of Erlangen. Here we are especially concerned with his book, *Die Letzten Dinge,* and Stange's *Das Ende aller Dinge,* which is, in part, a critical analysis of the position of Althaus. In the first edition of 1922 Althaus identified himself with the tendencies of the dialectic theology. Since the third edition appeared in 1926, however, he has been moving away from the one-sided emphasis on the "qualitative difference between time and eternity." This change is still more pronounced in the fourth edition of 1933. As successor to Hofmann in the university, Althaus accepts the intentions of the older Erlangen theology: to teach the old truth in a new garb. Yet by a peculiar twist of circumstances, Hofmann's teaching of the Last Things is anathema to Althaus. In Althaus, Hofmann has found his severest critic. According to Althaus, Christian redemption is not what Hofmann held it to be, a matter perceptible to the senses, but rather a matter of faith only. (He calls his own theology *Theologie des Glaubens.*) The divine kenosis, he says, does not take place *in* history, nor is the Second Coming an historical day. History in itself is an act of the *kenosis* of God, and the Second Coming will be the end of time.

What, then, according to Althaus, is the meaning of history? The older theology saw history as moving toward an appointed end: the expansion of the church and the culminating activity of evil. According to this view, the last times are to be regarded as the consummation of the whole course of history. Good and evil will be engaged in a final struggle wherein evil will be destroyed and God will be all in all. This Bible prophecy, is, in a secularized form, also a part of idealistic philosophy (see above). The Kingdom is here regarded as identical with the reign of reason, liberty, and fraternity, which will be materialized in history. Over against this view, Althaus regards eschatology as the only means that will disclose the true meaning of history. As nature, the world is ateleological; as history, it moves toward the coming of God. This *telos* of history, according to Althaus, will be materialized not in universal history, but rather in the life of each period. History moves not in a line, but in spirals (Latze); each epoch stands in an immediate relation to God. Hence the Second Coming is the end of history, but is not an historical occurrence; for the manifestation of divine glory lies beyond the possibilities of time and history.

In keeping with this view of history, Althaus rejects each and every teaching of an Intermediate State and Intermediate Kingdom. Like Luther he holds that *es ist vor Gott alles auf einmal geschehen* (see above). Consequently the perfection of the individual and the consummation of the world are to be regarded as simultaneous. Meanwhile, according to the

law of historical existence, the death of our beloved ones may be a matter of the past, while the Second Coming is a matter of the future. But is time also an element in God, Althaus asks? Does not every wave of time beat against the shore of eternity?

It goes without saying that the teaching of chiliasm is incompatible with this view of history. Likewise the controversy over the signs preceding the End loses much of its importance. As each epoch stands in immediate relation to God, the teaching of the signs must be "actualized" in order to be authentic for every generation, Althaus says. How this affects the doctrine of the Anti-Christ, is shown in our article in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* "A Re-Appraisal of Lutheran Unity," April, 1942 (especially pp. 117 f.) As to the restoration of Israel in Palestine, Althaus remarks that this people has ceased to hold a special place in the divine economy of salvation. The passages of the Old Testament which seem to favor such a view are not only "spiritually" fulfilled in Christ, as the older theology said, but are also judged and purified by Him. The crucified Messiah is the strongest evidence against Israel's claim to world domination. And concerning Paul's statement in Romans 11:25 that "all Israel shall be saved," Althaus holds that the church should not turn this "mystery" into a dogma. Israel *may,* as a nation, accept Christianity during the present order of the world. But evidently "all Israel," as the Apostle says, includes more than the last generation. In any case, Israel has no special calling since it crucified Jesus and killed His apostles.

We must come to a close. As we have seen, eschatology has been restored in recent theology to hold a central place in Lutheran dogmatics. The Kingdom is inseparable from the King. To believe in Christ the Lord is to wait for the Kingdom. Hence the prayers of the true church of all ages culminate in the closing words of the New Testament: AMEN, COME, LORD JESUS!

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS[1]

The Christ of the American Road. By E. Stanley Jones. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944. 255 pages. $1.

The publisher explains that this is a wartime book, designed to meet the specifications of the War Production Board in the national effort to conserve paper. This is a little book in appearance, fully streamlined, smartly cut for a man to carry about in his pocket, or to balance nicely under a bed lamp. Size has been sacrificed, but not content. The war has determined the external lines of the book, and it has also to a great extent given shape to its inner character. Yes, this is a wartime book, issuing not only "in compliance with the orders of the War Production Board," but also under the burning compulsion of the spirit of a man living in wartime and speaking out of a strong sense of the tremendous urgency of his message.

Writing with his customary fervency and characteristically evangelical spirit, the author of *The Christ of the American Road* now guides his fellow-Americans into a clearer recognition of Christ in American life. As he raises Him above the customary obstructions to their full view, he also helps them see their America through Him, sometimes showing in favorable light and frequently in shocking contrast. Walking thus with Christ in the fuller awareness of His clear spirit, one is more keenly conscious of his country's strength and also her tragic weakness, her real achievements and her sorry failures, and above all her unlimited possibilities.

As Dr. Jones outlines the seven hesitations of democracy in the practice of her democratic ideals, he drives home most effectively the great trouble we have had with the "all" in "All men are created equal" of the Declaration of Independence. Likewise, the seven hesitations of American Christianity tell the disturbing story of our shortcomings in the adoption of the Christianity of Christ.

The author's main thesis is that Christ is the integrating factor in our American life. In Him, as we conceive of Him embodying the Kingdom, America can come into its fullest realization. Its many divisions find in Him their reconciliation. He is the bridge for the great existing gaps. Christ is the New Man "through and around whom alone that new man may be produced out of both parties."

Some of these opposing parties which live on the American scene are: individualism and collectivism; capital and labor; religion and education; science and religion; the scientific and religious movements for health; the white and the colored races; religion and government; religious activism and apocalypticism; modernism and fundamentalism; evangelism and religious education; pacifism and approval of war. It is the author's certain conviction that in all these areas of our life there must and can be a new unity in Christ. In a number of cases both must change and meet in a new position before harmony and peace, based upon the truth, can be established.

Millions of Americans have known that E. Stanley Jones loved his Christ and his India. Some have wondered whether he was any longer a good American. Anyone thus troubled may now satisfy his mind beyond the speck of a doubt that Dr. Jones loves his America even as he does his Christ of the American road. And for the

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be secured through the United Lutheran Publication House, 1228 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

trouble of reading the testimony as contained in this streamlined, wartime book, one will be almost persuaded himself to become a better Christian and a better American.

D. F. PUTMAN

Return to Christianity. By Nels F. S. Ferré. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943. 76 pages. $1.

To a generation that has not only gone astray, but is actually lost, Nels F. S. Ferré offers his services as a guide for a "return to Christianity." In his analysis of the present situation Ferré declares that our age has been misled by science, which although it has heaped material benefits on man, has nevertheless led civilization to a dead-end street, and worse. But religion has little reason to nod its head sagely over the defection of science as a false messiah, for Christianity, both in its orthodox and liberal manifestations, has also failed to give adequate guidance.

The author advocates a return neither to a "Lilliputian theology" of orthodoxy, nor to a sterile modernism, but to a radical Christianity, resolutely centered in the New Testament God of *Agape,* characterized as "responsible, self-giving concern." How this radical Christianity deals with the basic problems of the individual, how it operates in the intensive and extensive fellowship of the church, and its application to the three critical problems of modern society—education, economics and world order —are sketched in successive chapters.

The book bears, all too plainly, the marks of its origin as a series of lectures before a pastor's conference, with the almost irresistible temptation of a lecturer to oversimplify and to make pontifical generalizations. Thus, to take one example, the author's stigmatization of conservative theology as "Lilliputian"—leaning on a "puny staff of literalism," believing in a "Ptolemaic God and a personal devil"—is neither true nor helpful. This is no apt characterization but a caricature of a theological position. In fairness to the author it should be said that his use of the red ink of sarcasm is sparing throughout the remainder of the book.

As a positive statement of the resources of the Christian faith in a bankrupt world, and as a serious attempt to apply "radical" Christianity to a topsy-turvy world, and turn it "right side up," this little book merits a careful reading by the Lutheran minister who, agreeing to disagree with the author in some points, shares with him the desire to "leave behind the old controversies and in the light of the fuller Christian truth march straight forward to a reformed church and a better social order."

JOHN W. RILLING

Christian Family Life. By Earl S. Rudisill. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1944. 90 pages. 30 cents.

The brief discussion of the Christian ideals for family life under review is presented by an associate secretary of the Parish and Church School Board of the United Lutheran Church in America, under the auspices of that board, as an adult level elective course in parish education. The material is divided into thirteen chapters, each chapter followed by questions for discussion, projects for individual or group action (by way of research or practice of the suggested ideals), and references to forty-odd other volumes for further study.

The discussion throughout, as anyone acquainted with Dr. Rudisill's forum on family problems in *The Lutheran* would expect, is characterized by sound judgment, wide acquaintance with current pedagogical science, and, best of all, facility in bringing the principles of Christian living to bear on the life of the family.

The publication of this volume at this time is doubtless related to the United Lutheran Church's current emphasis for the year on the Christian home. But such a work as this would be welcome in any year, for it is an instrument well designed to introduce serious thinking on Christian home obligations into the parish, whether through adult study groups or through circulation of the book among parents and prospective parents. Naturally so brief a treatment of so large a subject must be terse throughout and must seem sketchy at some points. Yet we have here an able introduction at least to the chief aspects of Christian family life, and the bibliographies attached to each chapter point the way for those whose further interest has been awakened.

PAUL J. KIRSCH

You That Labor. By Myron Lindblom. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1944. 77 pages. 25 cents.

This brochure is a unique approach to the problem of labor. It does not deal directly with the social, economic, or political aspects of the problem. In this sense the title may be misleading. Rather its purpose is individualistic, evangelical, and Scriptural.

The writer uses what might be called the "case method," if that is permissible in religion, to present his problem and solution. From his early experience as a worker in industry he is able clearly and effectually to produce a story of real life as it is lived in the ranks of labor. He knows the language, the attitudes, the conditions, the problems, and the needs of the average worker.

With this as a background he describes the life of a worker and his fellow-worker —the former a Christian and the latter an unbeliever. The author has described a technique by which a Christian may arouse in an unbeliever a consciousness of sin and the need of God. He begins at the shop, with the language and experience (this is vital!) of the worker and relates working conditions, individual, economic, and social, to the Carpenter, Christ. This approach makes the interest of Christ in the individual's conditions as real as the individual's own experience. Labor, the home, the church, war, the pastor, social conditions, and death are all worked into an interesting and effective solution of the individual's personal problems as touching Christ.

Favorable comments: (1) The story begins with man as an individual and his relations to God rather than with men in organizational, institutional, and social groups. The problems of society are first the problem of the individual. (2) It strikes at the fundamental purpose of Christ. It begins with sin and applies the Scriptural remedy. (3) It shows conclusively the responsibility and effectiveness of the personal approach to the problem of sin in the individual life. (4) It emphasizes the importance of the direct use of social conditions as a medium through which a man may or must find his Saviour. (5) It is a refreshing restating of the old problem of how to stimulate interest in an unbeliever. Here is a technique many pastors may use with success. It is psychologically, sociologically, and theologically sound. (6) It analyzes and purposes an emphasis in the work of the church which has fallen somewhat into disuse, practically speaking. Rather than the programs, organizations, campaigns, and slogans of the church, the emphasis is on a personal, individual, evangelistic procedure. (7) It reveals the effective power of a layman who is devoted to the work of Christ. The work of reclaiming has been for too long reposed in the hands of the clergy with the result that the laity is indifferent to and deprived of the greatest joy in Christ—winning others.

Unfavorable comments: (1) The individualistic approach is not enough. There is a social aspect of the Kingdom of God. (2) It has a tendency to be other-worldly, which

is only a part of the Gospel message. (3) The problem of an individual is not only himself. He is part of a community of persons, subject to institutional controls. Organized industry, corrupt politics, and selfish interests control conditions under which the Christian must live. When a family income does not provide the essential comforts, is it right to quote, "All things work together for good to them that love God?" That is an escape method and develops futility and frustrations. Rather all things work together for good when God's love is in men and also, with emphasis, in economic, political, and social relationships. God in man, yes; but man then is responsible for God among men.

In general the brochure makes a positive, constructive, and aggressive approach to labor, and as such to the problems of the individual. While it has its limitations from a social viewpoint, it does effectively analyze the problem of the individual and his relations to God. It is a splendid description of a procedure to arouse a sense of sin. And one that can be used successfully by others. All will not agree with all details but it must be admitted that the Scriptures, when applied with an understanding of the individual's background, do not fail to awaken an individual.

It should be good medicine for discouraged pastors, indifferent congregations, and the urban pastor who has tried to "keep the wheels" moving with programs and many organizations. It suggests a road back to the essential work of the pastor, and in particular something definitely constructive for the Christian to do—good for the laymen.

Read it and learn how men are remade.

W. Ray Hashinger

A History of the Evangelical Church. By Raymond W. Albright. Harrisburg: The Evangelical Press, 1942. xix, 501 pages. $3.50.

This book will undoubtedly stand for many years to come as the definitive history of this denomination. The complete and thorough treatment of the subject to 1941 precludes either the necessity or the opportunity for another treatment by any one now living. By action of the General Conference of the Evangelical Church, the Board of Publication and the Historical Society were given the responsibility of the preparation of the work. These agencies invited Dr. Albright to write the manuscript. He, by reason of his training as a historian and as a great-great-grandson of Jacob Albright, the founder of the denomination, combined the qualities which made possible the production of an accurate and sympathetic study.

Features of special interest and value are to be found in several Appendices. In addition to lists of officials, conference meetings, statistics, etc., usually found in works of this kind, there is a bibliography of thirty pages (Appendix G) which will be of the greatest service to students of American religious history generally. Extensive foot-noting indicates the wide and intelligent use of sources described in the bibliography.

The book, while well printed and usefully illustrated, is the unfortunate victim of wartime limitations on paper. It is to be hoped that in later and easier days a new press run will be made on paper of a quality more suited to the nature of the book.

Robert Fortenbaugh

The Chapel Hymnal. Authorized by the Intersynodical Committee on Hymnology and Liturgics for the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1944. 127 pages (103 hymns). 25 cents.

According to the foreword this little book (4¾ by 6¾) is intended for use at "open-air mission festivals, noonday Lenten services in public buildings, Easter sunrise services in the open, meetings of men's clubs, ladies' aid societies, young people's meet-

ings, summer and winter camp conferences, evangelistic services of various kinds, services in hospitals, infirmaries, penal institutions, services in military camps, naval stations, on shipboard." It includes, besides hymns, a few brief prayers and other worship materials, the Order of Matins, the Order of Vespers, a general prayer, and a topical and an alphabetical index.

The hymns chosen are simple, familiar ones—the old standbys. There is no presentation of any of the new and challenging material for occasional uses which has appeared in recent years. The printing is something of a makeshift wartime job. The music and words are not always arranged completely to fill the type page. A few of the pages are left half blank. Such a little hymnal, however, can be used many times when it is difficult to secure larger books. This is a practical venture.

THEODORE K. FINCK

Sweet Thames Run Softly. By Robert Gibbings. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1941.

Coming Down the Wye. By Robert Gibbings. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1943.

May I recommend for the preacher's early "must" list these two books from the pen of this Irish artist? The engraved illustrations are his own. Here are two books crammed full of homely reference to persons, things, and places, as the author comes leisurely down stream. Let this artist-naturalist be eyes and ears for you. I felt myself in tune with him at once and found out why in chapter thirteen of *Sweet Thames,* where he says: "My father was a parson, a canon at that, and he could have been a dean, the Dean of Ross, no less. But he was a large man, and when he went to inspect the deanery he found that there wasn't a room in the house in which he could sleep with his legs straight unless he put his feet through the window, and so he was compelled to remain a canon."

Coming Down the Wye is full of the lore of Wales. He had the right pace. "If we would glimpse behind that veil we must forget those fanatics who think that walking less than four miles per hour is a sign of laziness." You must not miss the Welsh pharmacopoiea.

Preachers need these books. It is said of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica,* one of the most remarkable works about God, "that it might have been written by a man blind from his birth; for there is not a page in Aquinas which betrays any evidence of the personal observation of nature." As I listen to preachers, I am often distressed at their barrenness in the same respect.

Critics have observed that Gibbings writes in the tradition of Izaak Walton and of Thoreau. I sense in all these pages what Andrew Lang said of the *Compleat Angler.* "It is a book to be marked with flowers, marsh-marigolds and fritillaries, and petals of the yellow iris, for the whole provokes us to content, and whispers that word of the Apostle, 'Study to be quiet.'"

Yes, this review belongs in a theological quarterly; for there is a great storehouse of homiletical material in "them thar books"—and perfect relaxation.

ARNOLD F. KELLER

Parish Practice: A Manual of Church Administration. By Paul. J. Hoh. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1944. 210 pages. $2.50.

Through the pages of this book the professor of Practical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia leaves the classroom and moves into the libraries of several hundred Lutheran pastors. It would be pleasant to predict an immediate

circulation with a more optimistic number, but a sampling of opinion exposes no great enthusiasm for a reading course in church administration among time-hardened brethren of the cloth in the U.L.C.A. Indeed, one acquaintance of no little eminence pish-poshed the assumption that there should exist such *genera* as teachers of Practical Theology, not to mention books on Parish Practice. "Why," said he with a prodigal gesture, "it's all a matter of common sense—and a sense of humor!" Grant the premise; since neither (1) common sense nor (2) a sense of humor inevitably accompany the possession of degrees and certificates from educational institutions, some man and/or some manual may well pursue the martyr way of indoctrinating both undergraduates and alumni with a smattering of (1) and (2). This attractive volume, fathered by Paul Hoh and mothered, with first-rate craftsmanship, by the Muhlenberg Press, is an able indoctrinator!

During these days of wartime restrictions any pedestrian reviewer dares to ask about the appearance of a new book, "Is it necessary?" Concerning the production of *Parish Practice*, theological faculties, educational advisers, and a publishing house have answered, like saints in the hymn, "Yes!" To their chorus one who has been in the ministry long enough to have learned some of the answers through the bitter schooling *(sic)* of past mistakes echoes a sheepish Amen. After digesting pages of this manual a reader may be led to inquire, "Why hasn't someone told me these things before?" only to have the whisper of memory, soft as conscience, reply, "Someone has!" But the "things" have not been told as Paul Hoh tells them; nor in any book has more practical guidance for a pastor in these times been gathered so invitingly and so concisely. *Parish Practice* will not replace John Oman's *Concerning the Ministry*, but it was not written for that purpose. The appearance of the book will not replace all former works treating somewhat of the same subject and hallowed by traditional use among the student generations. Nevertheless, I have a sneaking suspicion that the destiny of a copy of *Parish Practice*, owned by seminarian or pastor, will be that of a non-dust-gathering utility; while it may not be revered, it will be re-read.

To be sure, there are those with "theological interests" who will scorn these pages of opinions, problems, answers, and admonitions; some will remind their naive friends of the low standing held by administration and governing in that listing of gifts catalogued by St. Paul in the Corinthian correspondence; but in these years of church life even saints and sages are saddled with administrative responsibilities. The burdens cannot be dodged, in good conscience, so they had better be carried! *Parish Practice* is a guide to such burden-bearing; it is shot through with evangelical theology, practical wisdom, and good judgment. While a Lutheran bias colors the discussion, the non-Lutheran reader will discover no denominational chest thumping. The author's acceptable *apologia* stated briefly in the preface is expanded throughout the book; as evidence, consider a paragraph on page 23 and the closing sentence of the text on page 188: "Organization, administration, meetings: charter, constitution, by-laws; rules, regulations, procedures! What have these to do with 'the Holy Office of the Word and Sacraments'? Directly, perhaps nothing; indirectly, much. They are means—worldly means, yes—through which a group of believers in Jesus Christ can be molded into a working fellowship to do in the world, as it is, the things God himself has given them to do: to worship him, to edify his people, to evangelize his world, to render loving service to his needy ones." "And what matters most is that one keeps ever in mind and heart the call of God to minister, in his name and to his people, his word and his sacraments."

From what has gone before, this reviewer's opinion is evident, that it is high time for such a book as *Parish Practice* to be available. The guidance of the author is

relevant to church administration in country, town, or city; it is relevant to the problems of administration in missions or in well established congregations. In a day when many writers and speakers emphasize the contrasts between rural and urban ministries, it is heartening to have written recognition that the basic similarities between essential Christian tasks and necessary administrative functioning outweigh the real but frequently exaggerated differences. The Index, References, and Notes are helpful, but the "List of Publications Mentioned in the Text and Notes" is disappointing. It can be assumed that so careful a writer as Dr. Hoh surveyed his field thoroughly before publishing his work; then, according to the list, either few books have been written on the subject of church administration, or few of the volumes already published are worth consulting. Perhaps both alternatives are true! A superficial examination reveals approximately a dozen non-Lutheran authors in the reference list, and there is no mention of works published outside the United States. Does this mean that a specialized interest in parish administration is a phenomenon of twentieth century North American Christianity—particularly the Lutherans? Does it mean that our total church and denominational *milieu,* our point of view, and our polity are so unique in the historic stream as to require special treatment in the matter of parish practices? Perhaps this book, prosaic as its subject seems, is a pioneering venture.

To read no more than the first chapter of *Parish Practice* is to realize the diversity of procedures among Lutherans. Dr. Hoh writes concerning the reception of non-Lutheran evangelical church members into Lutheran congregations: "There is, properly, no transfer from one communion to another." "Dismissal" is the word! That sentence could start a healthy debate in some circles. Again, on the same subject, "Confirmation is not essential; but some sort of confession of faith . . . is essential." There are other circles where this statement would arouse heated discussion. Final judgment, according to the author, "must be based on Scripture, the principles of church polity, and the conscientious judgment of the pastor and the church council." While the author never presumes to speak "with authority," his opinions are characterized by faithfulness to the New Testament spirit, fair judgment, and a concern that dignity and orderliness shall mark the administering of congregational affairs. To read *Parish Practice* is once again to have the lights turned on, illuminating the authority and the Spirit-given responsibility of the Christian congregation, with "an ecumenical spirit and outlook always, but . . . also true to its own God-given nature—always." This book will educate toward common sense and stimulate the pastor's exercise of an understanding sense of humor.

L. Ralph Tabor

Liberal Theology. An Appraisal. Essays in honor of Eugene William Lyman. Edited by David E. Roberts and Henry Pitney Van Dusen. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1942. 285 pages. $2.50.

This volume of theological and philosophical essays in honor of Eugene William Lyman by sixteen of his former colleagues, friends, and spiritual relatives can be recommended chiefly for two reasons. In the first place most of these essays are written by outstanding scholars and therefore worth reading. In the next place the men who have contributed to this volume all represent more or less an era in the history of modern Christian thought which is characterized by the term "liberal theology" as over against the traditional orthodox faith.

The beginning of this era goes back to the middle of the nineteenth century and is to a large extent historically connected with the theology of Albredt Ritschl and his school. The movement reached its peak in the decades before the first World War.

But since the war—especially since the rise and rapid spread of the dialectical theology of Karl Barth and other related theological and philosophical trends of thought growing out of the experiences of the War and the time after the War, with its chaos, confusion, and gloomy forebodings of the future—the pre-War theological liberalism gradually has lost its popular appeal. With few notable exceptions the leaders of theological liberalism had never had a firm hold on the rank and file of the Christian people in our churches. But now also most of the younger theological generation began to turn away from them in increasing numbers and, as far as they had theological interests at all, followed other leaders. It is safe to say that the time when a second World War is fast drawing to its close also marks the close of an era in the history of Christian thought. The reign of liberal theology as commonly understood is definitely ended.

The editors of this volume are aware of the present situation. But they will probably disagree with our conclusion: they and their friends will continue to believe in the important place and permanent value of "liberal" theology in the real of Christian thought, refusing to see the handwriting on the wall; they will characterize their own theology as progressive and brand all other interpretations of the Christian faith as reactionary.

There is no question that liberal theology has made its contribution to many fields of human knowledge related to our Christian religion, especially in the fields of literary and historical research and criticism. But the Christian theologian whose own faith is deeply rooted in the Gospel, i.e., in the Christian message of salvation, requires something more: he will have to give an answer to the all-important question whether his theology is an adequate expression of that faith and therefore can become the firm foundation of the Christian *Kerygma*. Judged by this standard liberal theology, even at its best—and not liberal theology only, but all our feeble endeavors to comprehend with our mind the deepest mysteries of our faith—will have to listen to the voice of the prophet of old: "Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting." For now, as St. Paul writes, we see through a glass, darkly, and know only in part.

The editors have divided the book into three parts. Part I contains a fine, sympathetic, and appreciative article on the life and work of Eugene W. Lyman. Part II brings a group of seven essays under the general heading: The History of Liberal Theology. I mention only three names: Julius A. Bewer, Mary E. Lyman, Rufus Jones. The essays in Part III discuss The Foundations of Liberal Theology by a group of scholars, among them Henry Sloan Coffin and the late William Adams Brown. This reviewer regrets his inability to write this brief notice of an important publication at an earlier date.

H. Offermann

The Person of Christ. By Loraine Boettner. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943. 215 pages. $2.

The author addresses himself to the task of proving "who was, or who is Jesus Christ?" and does so by marshaling together all the Scripture passages which refer to Christ or have been so interpreted by theologians in the past. The theologians quoted are chiefly: Charles Hodges, A. H. Strong, Benjamin Warfield, J. Gresham Machen, J. Ritchie Smith, John Calvin, Samuel Craig, Joseph Stump, William C. Robinson, E. Y. Mullins, and Clarence E. McCartney.

The book is born of a profound faith in the divinity of Christ and led the author to a diligent study of the Bible. Typical chapter headings will indicate the author's line of development: Titles Ascribed to Christ; The Pre-existence of Christ; Attributes of

Deity Ascribed to Christ; The Sinlessness of Jesus; Christ the Messiah of the Old Testament; Christ's own Testimony Concerning His Deity; The Virgin Birth.

The author pleads for a revival of a vital faith in Christ that the witness of the church may be effectual in bringing the Gospel to men.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

Aids to Worship. By Albert W. Palmer. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. 140 pages. $2.

This collection of devotional literature has been assembled for use primarily as a handbook of public worship. The various numbers are arranged in sections such as "Introits and Calls to Worship," "Confessions of Faith," "Readings from the Bible," "Readings from Extra-Biblical Sources," "Litanies," "Prayers," occasional services, and orders of public worship.

Each item is numbered so that a service of worship, built up upon the material of the book, would require the worshiper to jump from place to place and page to page in this book between hymns sung from another book. It is prepared for non-liturgical churches, and seems to illustrate the difficulty such churches face in constructing an orderly form of worship. And at the same time it seems to manifest the desire on the part of non-liturgical churches to have a liturgy, or their need of one.

It is interesting to note the sources of the material. Less than a score of the numbers are quoted from masters of devotional literature out of the total of 264 selections. There are two items by St. Francis of Assisi and eight from a living author. Among authors quoted are Socrates, Marcus Aurelius, Edgar A. Guest, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, John Kendric Bangs, Tolstoy, Victor Hugo, Sam Walter Foss and Walt Whitman. In another class appear the names of Robert Browning, John Oxenham, John Henry Newman, and others. But there is very little from classical devotional literature.

Most of the responsive readings from the Bible are Psalms, and they are evidently intended to be used in addition to Scripture lessons in the service. The readings from extra-Biblical sources include one classic, Te Deum Laudamus, but also the words of Victor Hugo, Socrates, Edwin Markham, H. G. Wells, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, An Epistle to Americans (a parody on Hebrews 11), and material of lesser value.

The best of the numbers in the section entitled "Prayers" are from the Book of Common Prayer, though there are other usable prayers by Samuel McComb, James Martineau, Joseph Fort Newton, and William E. Orchard. Two ancient prayers of merit are quoted in the collection.

While a number of living authors are represented, one wonders whether the author has achieved his purpose to provide "devotional and poetical selections from the best spiritual aspirations *of our own day.*" The introduction speaks effectively of the use of music, the service of silence, and fervent preaching in worship. Dr. Palmer is an ardent believer in the worth of Christian worship and is doing his best to help non-liturgical churches to improve their worship.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

The Altar Guild. By David A. Menges. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1944. 50 pages. Paper covers, 40 cents.

This practical manual is written in answer to an urgent call for such a guide. Pastors, altar guilds, and others who care for the altar and its furnishings have need of such a manual.

The treatment of the various topics in this pamphlet is exceedingly brief. The subjects covered, however, include the most essential.

The sentence, "a warning not to obscure cross and lights on such occasions will be given under chapter on flowers," seems to be violated in the illustrations both on the cover and in chapter three, where the flowers rise higher than and tend to obscure the cross. One wonders why the flowers should separate the sacramental lights from the cross.

In this compact little volume is given, in detail, guidance on almost every possible detail in the function of an altar guild. Pastors should familiarize themselves with its contents and instruct the members of the altar guild how to fulfill their task and mission.

One sentence, "pastors may request different procedures," used in connection with the Holy Communion, will apply to other matters dealt with in the book. The bibliography is rather incomplete, though it is recognized that it is a questionable benefit to add a number of other volumes to the list because of unreliable details in such volumes otherwise and generally very good.

In the chapter on the use of colors a few more details might well have been added. But when all is said about omissions or differences, the manual is a very useful contribution. Its use will, if followed, eliminate many undesirable practices, improve the sanctuary, and properly care for the altar and its equipment.

Proper preparation of the place of worship may function effectively toward a proper spirit of worship. The service of an altar guild is an opportunity for a devoted laity to render a very valuable and helpful ministry. We all need to learn to "reverence His sanctuary."

HARVEY D. HOOVER

BOOKS RECEIVED

For the information of its readers and in acknowledgment to the publishers, THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY publishes the following list of books received. More extended notice will be given to as many of them as space permits.

Edward Kuhlmann, *Proudly We Hail. A Modern Interpretation of Luther's Coat of Arms.* Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1944. 72 pages. $1.

Halford E. Luccock, *In the Minister's Workshop.* Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944. 254 pages. $2.

Laurence J. McGinley, *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives.* Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1944. 165 pages. $2.75.

Louise Saxe Eby, *The Quest for Moral Law.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1944. 289 pages. $3.25.

Elmer A. Seefeld, *Physical Education for Elementary Grades.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1944. Paper, illustrated. 221 pages. $1.75.

Scott Francis Bremer, *The Way of Worship: A Study in Ecumenical Recovery.* New York: Macmillan, 1944. 200 pages. $2.

Paul Scherer, *For We Have This Treasure.* New York: Harpers, 1944. 212 pages. $2

Erwin Kurth and Walter E. Buszin, eds., *The Graduals for the Church Year.* The Concordia Liturgical Series for Church Choirs. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1944. Paper. 103 pages. $1.25.

W. Arndt, *The Life of St. Paul, The Greatest Missionary.* Concordia Teacher Training Series. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1944. Paper. 109 pages. 25 cents. (Instructor's Guide, $1. Test Sheets, 10 cents.)

Raymond T. Stamm, *The Revelation of St. John and the Present Crisis.* Revised and reprinted from *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* July, 1942. Gettysburg: Author, 1944. Paper. 15 cents; 10 or more, 10 cents.

Martin Anderson, *Planning and Financing the New Church.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1944. Large format, illustrated. 80 pages. $3.

William Warren Sweet, *Revivalism in America: its Origin, Growth and Decline.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944. 192 pages. $2.

John R. Mott, *The Larger Evangelism.* Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944. 103 pages. $1.

Alfred Doerffler and W. E. Eifert, *Know the Truth.* A Series of Outlines on the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion for the Instruction of Adults for Church Membership. St. Louis: Concordia, 1944. Paper. 32 pages. 20 cents.

Ruth Strang, *A Study of Young Children.* Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944. Paper. 160 pages. 60 cents.

Announcing

PARISH PRACTICE

timely, vital reading for pastors and others interested in church administration

By PAUL J. HOH, D.D.

This 224 page volume, written in Dr. Hoh's friendly, popular style, is our most recent publication.

The author is professor of practical theology at Mt. Airy Seminary. In the course of this work he has developed a counseling service for pastors and it is from their specific problems, as well as from his own experience in the pastorate, that the practical aspects of the book have been drawn.

Working profoundly from principle to practice and accurately, by virtue of careful thought and study, Parish Practice treats:

The administrative problem of the pastor, the function and characteristics of the church council, supervision of church employes, care of church property, church finance, publicity and promotion, records and reports, church discipline, the relation of the congregation and the community, etc. Transfusing the technical study is a warm understanding of The Church, its pastor and people in their relation to the Kingdom of God.

Price $2.50

THE UNITED LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE

Ministers of the Printed Word

1228 SPRUCE STREET, PHILADELPHIA 7, PA.

CHICAGO 11 PITTSBURGH 22 COLUMBIA 3